

Against the Current

THE LIFE OF KARL HEINZEN

(1809-80)



KARL HEINZEN

Against the Current

THE LIFE OF KARL HEINZEN

(1809-80)

BY CARL WITTKE

*It is hard to swim against the current, but
it is upstream that one finds the source, and
the clearer, fresher water.*—KARL HEINZEN



UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO • ILLINOIS

University of Chicago Press • Chicago 37
Agent: Cambridge University Press • London

Copyright 1945 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. Published January 1945. Composed and printed by the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

P R E F A C E

KARL HEINZEN'S CAREER EPITOMIZES THE CRUSADING spirit of those irrepressible reformers who constituted a significant though minor group in the German immigration of the middle nineteenth century. Radicals, rationalists, republicans, intellectuals, they introduced a powerful leaven into the American body politic which was an active factor in American life for several decades.

Heinzen was an uncompromising, unbending, militant, radical republican, a crusader against censorship, bureaucracy, militarism, and reaction in his native Germany, a radical abolitionist, and a champion of equal rights for women and many other political, economic, and social reforms in the United States, which became his adopted fatherland in 1850 and in which he labored for thirty years.

Heinzen had played an interesting role as an extreme republican in the liberal movement of western Europe in the first half of the last century which culminated in the revolutions of 1848 and 1849. Uprooted by that noble but misguided and futile attempt to unify the German states into a federal republic, Heinzen came to the United States along with many other "Forty-eighters." Many of his contemporaries lost their liberalism as they prospered in a new land; Heinzen did not. He did not settle down to that physical comfort and complete self-satisfaction so many German-Americans confuse with *Gemüthlichkeit*; Heinzen was not primarily interested in singing societies, skat clubs, lodges, *Turnvereine*, and beer evenings. He had higher ideals concerning the cultural mission of the German

element in the United States, and for three decades he tried to shake his fellow-countrymen out of their intellectual and cultural lethargy.

For more than a quarter-century Heinzen fought on this side of the Atlantic for that concept of the rights of man which had inspired his revolutionary activities abroad. A born journalist, he did not prosper, for he preferred to have his paper "read, not just paid for." He espoused a personal journalism, which properly may be compared with that of Horace Greeley and some of the other great American journalists of his day.

In 1871 most German-Americans swelled with understandable pride because of the defeat of France and the unification of the fatherland under the leadership of Prussia. Heinzen did not accept the Bismarckian Empire, nor did he ever make his peace with the Hohenzollerns. He foresaw the consequences, for Europe and the Western world, of an empire built upon Prussia and the divine right of kings and supported by militarism and the special privilege of the Junker class. In language that sounds strangely prophetic in these days of a second world war, Heinzen, as early as 1850, had urged the United States to abandon its traditional policy of neutrality and nonintervention and frankly to accept its mission to crush the forces of reaction wherever they existed, to help make the world safe for democracy, and to build an international organization based upon the reign of law and the rights of man.

Surely such a man deserves a biography. He, too, was a German; and it is well to recall that once there was a strong liberal, republican, cosmopolitan group in the German states which is the absolute antithesis of present-day naziism. Men like Heinzen were proud of their cultural heritage and ashamed of the chauvinistic nationalism and the reaction that dominated their native land. Heinzen's lifelong goal was a republic which would be conceived in liberty, and responsible always to the popular will, and whose aim would be world peace, freedom under law, and respect for the rights of all men.

My friends and colleagues have helped me greatly in the preparation of this biography. First of all, I must express my thanks to Miss Henriette M. Heinzen, of Pasadena, California, granddaughter of Karl Heinzen, who permitted me to use the Heinzen manuscripts and who has furnished scores of personal items which I would otherwise have missed. Her brother, Karl P. Heinzen, of Boston, also made some valuable material available to me. Through the courtesy of Miss Agnes Inglis, of the Labadie Collection of the library of the University of Michigan, I was able to use a complete file of Heinzen's *Janus* and an excellent file of *Der Pionier*. In addition, Miss Inglis called my attention to the Schmemann manuscripts and to numerous other items. Mrs. Beatrice S. Fetz, of Ossining, New York, daughter of George Schumm, a disciple of Heinzen, sent me several of her father's letters. Mr. August Ruedy, of Cleveland, let me use his files of the *Republik der Arbeiter*, *Die Turnzeitung*, and the *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*. Mr. Albert Steinhäuser, of New Ulm, Minnesota, sent me bound files of the Milwaukee *Freidenker* for 1880 and 1881.

I have received valuable aid and suggestions from my friends and colleagues, Professor Ernst Feise of the Johns Hopkins University, Professor Warren S. Tryon of Simmons College, Professors F. W. Kaufmann, W. Stechow, and R. B. Frost of Oberlin, Professor A. B. Faust of Cornell, and Professor Harold S. Jantz of Clark University. Finally, I want to express my great appreciation for the many kindnesses extended to me by Miss Mary C. Venn, reference librarian of the Oberlin College Library.

CARL WITTKÉ

OBERLIN, OHIO
July 15, 1944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One

FORMATIVE YEARS

Page 1

Chapter Two

IN THE SERVICE OF HIS PRUSSIAN MAJESTY

Page 17

Chapter Three

THE MAKING OF A REVOLUTIONARY

Page 33

Chapter Four

REVOLUTION IN PRACTICE

Page 53

Chapter Five

THE TRIALS AND STRUGGLES OF A RADICAL JOURNALIST

Page 82

Chapter Six

HEINZEN THE MAN

Page 111

Chapter Seven

HEINZEN'S PHILOSOPHY OF RADICALISM

Page 148

Chapter Eight

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR THE NEGRO

Page 171

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Nine

A BLUEPRINT FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Page 199

Chapter Ten

SOCIAL REFORM WITHOUT COMMUNISM

Page 229

Chapter Eleven

A RADICAL'S FOREIGN POLICY

Page 250

Chapter Twelve

THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICANIZATION

Page 282

Chapter Thirteen

THE CLOSING YEARS

Page 308

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Page 327

INDEX

Page 329

CHAPTER ONE

FORMATIVE YEARS

IN THE ARCHIVES OF THE BURGOMASTER OF Grevenbroich, in the district of Düsseldorf, Germany, there is a document recording the birth of a son, February 22, 1809, to Joseph Heinzen and his wife, Eisetze Schmitz. As witnesses to the event, Pierre von der Bohlen, "fabricant," and Mathias Holdan, of the forestry service, affixed their signatures. The infant received the name "Charles Pierre," and the document was executed in French, for at that time this section of the lower Rhine country was still under the domination of Napoleon.

Grevenbroich, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, was a little town of peasants and burghers, not much different from hundreds of other German communities. It lay on the Erft River, a small tributary of the Rhine, below Cologne, and about thirteen and a half miles from Düsseldorf, which was the administrative center for the area. The Erft winds its way through a slate mountain upland, sufficiently attractive scenically to make Grevenbroich in more recent years a center for a modest tourist trade from Holland. The population of the town has grown to somewhere between four and five thousand today. Grevenbroich is the seat of a local court, a Gymnasium, and several other schools, the headquarters of some minor government officials, and a small center for aluminum mining and textile and machine manufacturing. As in Heinzen's day, it remains a natural center for the local trade which moves through the valleys of the Rhenish plateau.

Like so many other communities in the lower Rhine country, Grevenbroich has a long history. It lay in the pathway of warring armies in the many dynastic struggles of medieval and modern times, and on more than one occasion the hosts of war swept across the little Erft Valley. One of the ancient Roman roads ran from Mülforth through Grevenbroich and on to Cologne, and in the 1860's archeologists excavated Roman mosaics, coins, and cemeteries in the neighborhood. In the middle of the fourth century Grevenbroich was overrun by the Franks; the Spaniards made it a battleground in the sixteenth century; and during the Thirty Years' War the region was so thoroughly plundered and ravaged that Grevenbroich never really recovered from these devastating raids. In 1296 a Catholic cloister was established in the town, which already boasted a castle, and both were rebuilt many times in succeeding centuries. The region has remained predominantly Catholic, and even today less than one-seventh of the population of Grevenbroich belongs to the German Lutheran church. In 1801 the town became French by the Treaty of Lunéville; in 1816, after the final overthrow of Napoleon, it was transferred to Prussia.

Comparatively little is known of the important, formative boyhood years of the lad who was born a Frenchman and named Charles Pierre and who, at the age of seven, found himself a subject of Prussia. The French version of his name, under the impact of this transference of political allegiance, was changed to Karl Peter, and in later years the middle name dropped out altogether, and the first name frequently was spelled with a C.

Heinzen's father came from the village of Mundorf, on the right bank of the Rhine, below Bonn. Like his father before him, he was a man of great physical strength. For three generations at least, the Heinzens were men of extraordinary physical vitality. One of Heinzen's uncles, a pastor in Düsseldorf, was six feet five inches tall and of massive physique, and

Karl Heinzen was no exception to the family pattern in this regard. If we may believe the family record, carefully preserved by Joseph Heinzen, Karl's father, the baby born in 1809 weighed fourteen and a half pounds at birth.

The parents of Heinzen's father were peasant farmers, beholden for their land to the clerical authorities of the Cathedral of Cologne. Their son attended the Gymnasium of that city and studied philosophy, jurisprudence, and forestry at the University of Bonn, supplementing his theoretical training for a career in forestry by practical work with a forester in Bonn. Joseph Heinzen received his first post in 1795 and became a "garde général des camps et forêts" under the French Republic. At various times he held appointments in Sarrebruck, Birkenfeld, Liège, Bonn, Aachen, and Kleve. Among his father's papers which Karl Heinzen carried with him into exile, there are several testimonials from both German and French authorities which attest that Joseph Heinzen was an able and faithful public servant. In the course of a long career in the forestry service, he published several treatises on the legal aspects of a forester's duties and a standard handbook of instructions for private foresters and administrators of estates.

There is considerable evidence to show that Joseph Heinzen, in his youth, was an enthusiastic republican. His papers contained numerous pamphlets and addresses on the nature of the republican state and the social contract, and in 1797 he agitated for the establishment of an independent republic on the left bank of the Rhine, based on the French revolutionary principles of the rights of man. He tried hard to persuade some of his former teachers to join him in this separatist movement and in the crusade for liberty, fraternity, and equality. Strangely enough, Karl Heinzen regarded his father as a royalist, for the latter apparently never spoke to his son of the republican activities which had marked his younger days. It was only after the father's death that an examination of his papers revealed evidence of his earlier adherence to the principles of the French

Revolution. In 1814 the elder Heinzen received an appointment as general secretary of the forestry service under the Prussian government, with headquarters at Aachen, and later he became inspector of forests at Kleve, a position which he filled with distinction until he was forced to retire somewhat prematurely in order to make a place for a favorite of a petty Prussian prince, although he had adjusted his political views completely to the more conservative Prussian regime when he had found it advisable as a faithful civil servant to do so.

Karl Heinzen always described his father as honest, humane, and deserving of respect. But he never loved him. The father was a silent man who seldom revealed himself to anyone, least of all to his son, whom he really never understood. The elder Heinzen was severe and pedantic rather than friendly, flexible, and understanding. For that reason he must bear his share of responsibility for a son who developed an untractable, irascible, rebellious temperament which he could not shake off during his entire lifetime.

Of Heinzen's mother there is very little known. She was born in Nievenheim in 1776 and baptized Maria Elizabetha Schmitz. Her parents were middle-class farmers. In 1804 she married Joseph Heinzen. Wilhelm Heinzen, a relative of the bridegroom and pastor in Witlar, performed the ceremony. On May 13, 1813, when she was little more than thirty-six years old, she died after an illness of three years, the probable victim of tuberculosis. With all the rites of the Catholic church, of which she was a faithful member, she was buried in Nievenheim beside her father and a son who had died in 1810 at the age of three. During her nine years of married life she had borne five children. Karl, who was but four years old when she died, could have known little of the woman whose memory he cherished through all the years of his life, but he always paid tribute to her beauty, loveliness, intelligence, and great common sense which he believed made up for her lack of formal education. Moreover, he always ascribed to her early death many of the

difficulties he encountered in later years. "Without a mother, there can be no family," Heinzen wrote in his memoirs. "Hostility and compulsion never succeeded with me, love and kindness would have developed all my potentialities."¹

After his mother's death the boy lived with relatives for the next eight years, first with an aunt at Nievenheim, at the home of his maternal grandparents, and then, at the age of nine, he was sent to a relative, a devout Catholic who was "Domherr" of the local church at Wiltar. Though motivated by the best intentions and eager to do their full duty, these relatives were not overly successful in their efforts to train the motherless boy. They did not spare the rod, but they helped to spoil the child.

Being reared a Catholic, in a Catholic family, in a predominantly Catholic community, it was not unnatural that the boy should be trained for the priesthood. So young Heinzen was chosen, like other lads in the community, to serve as acolyte at the Mass and to carry the cross in religious processions through the village on church holidays. An uncle who was a priest apparently planned to make the boy his successor. Heinzen admitted that his uncle was a man of exemplary morals and genuinely devoted to the welfare of his fellow-men, but he himself rebelled against a career in the church. If the account written many years later when Heinzen was anxious to represent himself as a rebellious nonconformist from the very beginning can be trusted, the lad resisted, at the early age of ten, the carefully laid plans which destined him for the church and, at the age of thirteen, broke completely with most of the fundamental tenets of that ancient institution.

When Karl Heinzen was twelve years old, his father moved to Kleve, where the little family, consisting of the father and four children—two sisters and two brothers—was reunited. Kleve was the center of the ancient Duchy of Cleves, important in European affairs, lay and ecclesiastical, from early medieval

¹ *Erlebtes*, Part I: *Vor meiner Exilierung* (Boston, 1864), p. 10.

to modern times. A prosperous, beautiful, and fruitful land, it was surrounded by forests and attractive hills overlooking fertile valleys. Like many another strategically located region, it had been passed back and forth between the Germans and the French on several occasions. Part of the ancient duchy had belonged to the Batavian Republic in 1803; part was once under the king of the Netherlands; and after the fall of Napoleon the region became Prussian again. Kleve itself was a well-built old medieval city, with an upper and a lower town, and a famous old castle, "Die Schwanenburg," with its historic tower and its museum of Roman antiquities. Its population, about a decade after Heinzen lived there, was approximately eight thousand.

The lad of twelve was enrolled in the Gymnasium at Kleve, and from the very outset he had more than the ordinary difficulties in making the adjustment to the demands of his teachers and to the school's routine. The father rigorously supported the former in their efforts to discipline his problem child. Karl seems to have been a highly imaginative youth who lived during his adolescence largely in a world of fantasy, peopled by men and women with whom he carried on a lively intercourse and to whom he actually wrote letters, though they existed only in his imagination. The boy hunted birds' nests, chased squirrels into the trees, picked wild flowers, and roamed through the neighboring woods, all to the neglect of his school assignments. He evidently liked the town and its environs, and he loved to fish on his father's farm, about a half-hour walk from Kleve itself—a distance which Karl and an elder brother negotiated twice each day. To make his world of fantasy complete, the boy imagined himself in love with his grandmother's maid, a red-cheeked peasant girl who took the lad to her native village on Sundays, and with a sixteen-year-old, pale-faced widow's daughter whom he worshiped from afar.

Heinzen's record at the Gymnasium was essentially that of an unruly, prankish youngster who had brains enough but who

would not submit to discipline. His father had little sympathy for his son's poetic fantasies and constantly held before him the superior virtues of an elder brother. Relentless pressure to reshape the boy according to more standardized and acceptable patterns bred resentment, stubbornness, and revolt. It was unfortunate that much of this feeling was directed against the father and a brother, who seems to have tyrannized over the younger boy and to have received special favors at home. The strict Prussian educational system of command and compulsion, however successful with others, was a failure as far as young Heinzen was concerned; and the lad was frequently and severely punished, at home and in school, for what he described in later years as mere pranks resulting from the exuberance of youth and a legitimate desire to develop his individuality. In his memoirs Heinzen had much to say in criticism of a system of education which appealed only to fear and sought to suppress all individual variation in the interests of a standardized pattern.

Within a year the situation at the Gymnasium at Kleve had reached such a crisis that the father felt it necessary to send the boy to Kempen, where a friend conducted a private school in a former monastery and employed a number of priests as teachers. Here the lad of thirteen continued his rebellious tactics. He objected to the regulation that forced him to attend church each morning, and he resented the iron discipline of the classroom. It must be added that he developed a particular dislike for mathematics, and this may have been as much a cause of his unhappiness as his objections to routine. This time the father actually intervened in the boy's behalf and persuaded the director of the school to modify his methods. Thereafter the boy did much better work, and his whole attitude changed so greatly that in later years he referred to his teacher at Kempen as a man of real talents and understanding. Heinzen finished the year with a record good enough to permit his return to the Gymnasium at Kleve.

Here the story of insubordination was repeated. The boy

was sulky, headstrong, and temperamental. He wrote satirical verses and quarreled and argued with his teachers in the classroom, but he managed to finish enough of the senior grade to secure admission to the University of Bonn, late in 1827, as a student of medicine.

Since Heinzen carefully preserved the reports of his studies at Kempen and at the royal Gymnasium at Kleve among his papers and manuscripts, a precise notion of what he actually accomplished there can be obtained. The record for the year spent at Kempen described his work in Greek, German, French, drawing, and history as praiseworthy and his work in Latin, religion, and mathematics and nature study as only fair. The document testified that the boy had been "generally industrious" in his home preparations, that his written work often was too hastily done but generally good, and that "his conduct improved considerably in every respect this summer." At Kleve he attended the Gymnasium from 1818 to the fall of 1823, returned to the *Sekunda* in 1824, and thereafter spent one year in *Prima*. The transcript of dismissal, made out to "C. Peter Heinzen," "of Catholic faith," revealed that he did his best work in Latin, Greek, and history—subjects in which he was genuinely interested. His marks in grammar were good, and his teachers reported that he wrote well. He did little with natural science, and in mathematics he accomplished "practically nothing." His morals were reported as good, but his conduct and deportment were described as bad, and there was a further notation on the transcript to the effect that this student "wants to be original."

After an examination by the committee on entering students, Heinzen enrolled at the University of Bonn. The committee found that he could translate Latin with ease and that he was not "unskilled" in Greek, although he was weak in mathematics and utterly ignorant of physics. His knowledge of ancient and modern history and geology proved to be "fairly accurate" and decidedly above the elementary level, and his written work

was pronounced completely satisfactory. Armed with these testimonials, "Petrus Heinzen, Cliviensem" was matriculated at the ancient university as a *studiosus medicinae*.

During the winter of 1827-28 Heinzen registered for several courses in anatomy and pursued them, according to his professors, "with splendid industry." He took work in experimental physics and performed it satisfactorily. Though he did not attend his class in logic with much regularity, he apparently pursued with interest and industry his other courses in botany, chemistry, zoölogy, and mineralogy. What happened the next year is not clear from the record. Although he preserved the document, Heinzen blotted out with heavy ink every notation made thereon by his professors. It is clear from other sources that by this time the attractions and temptations of German student life had completely overshadowed those of the lecture-room and the laboratory.

Heinzen had joined the student corps, "Westphalia," and promptly distinguished himself as one of the hardest drinkers and one of the best duelers in the university, a record of which he later was thoroughly ashamed and which led him to denounce German student life in such unmeasured terms. There is little evidence that Heinzen worked hard at anything academic during his last year at Bonn. He was the prepetrator of numerous student pranks and had something of a reputation as a student journalist. He carried on a painful and acrimonious correspondence with his father about his allowance and contended that he was being deprived of several thousand dollars due him as an inheritance from his mother. He complained that he was forced to live in a noisy street in poor quarters above a tinsmith's shop. He came to dislike medicine, and, when his first attempt at dissection made him violently ill, he decided to confine his energies thereafter to the more interesting fields of aesthetics and history and literature and definitely to abandon medicine for philology.

In 1829 "Petrus Heinzen, Rhenanus, Stud. medicinae" was

dismissed by the rector of the university because of inattention to his academic duties and too much student life. Heinzen later tried to make a case for himself on other grounds and argued that his dismissal was the result of a clash with the authorities over academic freedom. That he opposed certain efforts of the university to impose discipline and to enforce regulations, in an insulting speech delivered in the market place at Bonn, is well established, and that a student with Heinzen's temperament and propensities clashed with his professors is not unlikely; but the attempt to explain the dismissal on high grounds of academic freedom rather than for neglect of work is not convincing, even in Heinzen's own terms, and he readily admitted that less honorable causes operated as well.²

On May 1, 1829, Heinzen wrote his father from Bonn in such deep dejection that the letter referred to suicide. He begged him for travel money and for enough to pay his four months' bills, so that he might extricate himself from the university altogether and return to Kleve. What his father replied remains unknown. Heinzen left the university, but he did not return to his home. Instead, he chose the career of a soldier of fortune in the Dutch foreign legion. Six years after the debacle at Bonn, Heinzen apparently considered, for a brief period, the possibility of returning to his medical studies. He wrote a letter of inquiry to the ministry of education in Berlin and received the tactful, diplomatic reply that the suspension from Bonn might be lifted but that he would have to present a certificate showing the satisfactory completion of the full curriculum of a Gymnasium before he could be reinstated as a university student. There is no evidence that Heinzen ever entertained the idea of returning to medicine again, although all his life he continued to be interested in medical and scientific questions. His whole formal education had turned out to be a sad experience. His talents were great enough, but they were never adequately disciplined.

² *Ibid.*, p. 44.

Heinzen's plan to enlist as a petty officer for service in Batavia was the product of the mind of a youthful romantic, in the midst of his years of storm and stress, and was not unaffected by the knowledge that a return home after expulsion from the university would lead to embarrassment and trouble. So, with a friend, the former student departed for Rotterdam to enlist in the foreign legion. He falsely reported his residence as Hamburg. The passport issued to him at the end of his Dutch service described him as a young man with an "oval face, long forehead, gray eyes, and brown hair"—and a native of Hamburg. It recorded the facts that he entered the Dutch service on September 16, 1829, became a corporal a few weeks later, reached Batavia on March 11, 1830, and three weeks afterward rose to the rank of sergeant.

In later years Heinzen attributed the whole unfortunate Batavian adventure to his romantic, sentimental German nature. As a youthful dreamer, he had written a poem deploring that the age of knighthood had passed. He craved action and was motivated at the time by a strong nationalistic urge to have Germany expand, become a sea power, and acquire her share of colonies. The romantic, nationalist feelings which his friend Freiligrath expressed later in poetic form, Heinzen wanted to translate into travel and adventure. The tale of a Dutch sea captain who had returned to Frankfurt with considerable treasure no doubt also was a factor in stimulating Heinzen's desire to go to Java. Here he expected to win epaulets and decorations and enough wealth to enable him to travel from Sumatra and India and Persia to Constantinople and then, by way of Greece, Sicily, Italy, Switzerland, and France, back to his ancestral Germany. A Dutch colonel on leave from Batavia counseled Heinzen and his young friend against undertaking the adventure, but his efforts proved of no avail. In September, 1829, Heinzen and a friend who had already seen service in the Danish army appeared at Harderwyk, the depot for Dutch colonial troops, to enlist for service in the East Indies.

Because of an agreement between Holland and Germany, the Dutch at first refused to accept a German recruit who had not yet performed the required year of military service at home; but persuasion, aided by a bit of bribery, finally produced a letter addressed to a sergeant in Amsterdam, who advised Heinzen to enlist as a native Hamburger who had lost his passport. The obliging Dutchman thereupon provided a new passport, with which Heinzen returned to Harderwyk, where he was officially enrolled as a recruit and was promised promotion as soon as he had mastered the elements of military drill.

Though allowed to live outside the barracks and granted two furloughs to Amsterdam, Heinzen quickly tired of his new venture as a soldier. In a letter to his family he described the beggars, drunkards, thieves, and deserters whom he encountered in the foreign legion, and he wrote several interesting character sketches of his fellow-mercenaries. The Dutch colonial army he characterized as the cesspool of Europe. He asked his father to send him an atlas and a geography and thanked him for a gift of money which the new recruit thought might be used effectively with the officers in order to secure better treatment. After several weeks, Heinzen got his corporal's stripes and, later, those of a sergeant.

On October 30, 1829, the motley group of a hundred and thirty men set sail in two little ships for Amsterdam, where they were transferred to another vessel and, eleven days later, to a spick-and-span, hundred-foot-long East Indiaman, which was making its maiden voyage to the Orient. Though the ship was new, Heinzen complained of the dark, low, crowded quarters. On November 14 the vessel passed the chalk cliffs of Dover and headed into the open sea. His first view of the great ocean left a deep impression on the youthful soldier, and he wrote of its unfathomable, mysterious character, of his own insignificance, and of the terrors of the first storm which he encountered off the coast of Portugal. But these impressions

were soon overcome by the unmitigated boredom of a long voyage with a group of men with whom Heinzen had little in common. He described in detail the monotonous food, the tropical heat, and all the smells that came up from the hold of the troop transport. The ship proceeded past the Canaries and Cape Verde Islands, where it encountered a Spanish slaver bound for America with its human cargo. As the expedition rounded the Cape of Good Hope, the weather turned bitter cold, and the ship ran into violent storms. On March 8, 1830, the shore line of Java and Sumatra at last came in sight.

Upon his return Heinzen published a volume describing his Dutch East India adventure under the title *Reise eines deutschen Romantikers nach Batavia*, of which a second, enlarged edition appeared in Mannheim in 1845. The book is an interesting piece of narrative writing. Its chapters are of uneven merit and importance, but the style is forceful, incisive, and interesting, and its description of the Dutch East Indies assumes a new importance now that Americans have just begun to be conscious of an area which was the scene of Heinzen's adventures over a century ago.

The first sight that met Heinzen's eyes in Batavia was that of native convicts, working in chains. The contrast between human slavery and the beautiful luxurious vegetation of tropical Java depressed him greatly. The Malayan natives, well-built, ugly little men with coal-black teeth, came out in boats to sell chickens, apes, parrots, and fruits to the passengers. The ship threaded its way among the little islands of the Sunda Strait and finally, on March 12, cast anchor at Batavia, where a native rebellion had just come to an end.

Heinzen hated the barracks life of the Dutch foreign legion. Cholera and diarrhea broke out frequently among the men, and beating was used as a disciplinary measure. The troops rose at six, drilled after breakfast until ten o'clock, slept through the noon heat, drilled again at four o'clock, then enjoyed liberty after supper to promenade and visit the drinking-places and

Chinese gambling-houses where wine was cheap. At nine they were ordered to bed. This routine soon became monotonous, and Heinzen sought diversion by attending the Sunday concerts and by participating in the night life which began at seven each evening. It was then that the bats and birds and snakes and frogs came to life and, with them, the Dutch nabobs, who rode out in their luxurious carriages, accompanied by their Malay servants, bearing flaming torches before their masters.

Heinzen described the opium dens, the "houses of love," the cockfights, and the native women. The latter he found attractive in their oriental dreaminess, though he did not like their hair, which they anointed with coconut oil, or their teeth, which were stained black from tobacco juice. He hated the Chinese coolies and exhausted his stock of adjectives in describing their servility. Probably because he had too limited an opportunity to study it, he wrote little about the Dutch administrative system; but he denounced the brutal treatment of the natives and the lack of educational opportunities provided for them. For the Dutch East Indian military, Heinzen could find no words adequate to express his hatred and contempt. And yet, withal, he could not escape the magic charm of the tropics and the overpowering wonder and beauty of tropical nights.

Heinzen's *Journey to Batavia* contains a brief and inadequate chapter on Malay speech and folk music, another on the love story of a white officer and a native woman, and another on military tactics in East Indian wars. The book provides a recounting of native wedding ceremonies which the young mercenary witnessed, an account of the life and customs of the Dutch aristocracy, a description of the governor's palace and of the theater, and critical attacks on the graft and dishonesty of the Dutch colonial system. Heinzen collected native animals, roamed over the countryside to visit Malay temples, villages, and cemeteries, and returned with Javanese canes, sun parasols, and other keepsakes. He also brought back a few poetic fragments written

in Batavia. One was a poem to music and another a tribute to the memory of his friend who had died on the homeward voyage as the ship was passing St. Helena, Napoleon's last island home.

After three months in the East Indies, Heinzen was so disillusioned and homesick that his "fatherland became heaven and Batavia hell." Disheartened and ill, he approached his friendly colonel for help in extricating himself from his unhappy venture. The colonel suggested an appeal to the governor, provided Heinzen could repay the cost of his trip out and finance his way back home. Heinzen paid what he could, and the colonel loaned him the rest by signing a note to the ship's captain for 600 gulden. After a voyage of five months, Heinzen's ship docked at Falmouth, and he went on to London by another boat, looked at the Tower of London, and then proceeded by packet to Rotterdam. Here he sold his dead brother's gold watch to a sailor in order to raise funds to continue his journey. He arrived penniless in Utrecht, but he nevertheless resisted the desires of a Dutch widow who was his traveling companion and apparently wished more intimate company, and spent the night in the police station before proceeding across the border into Germany.

Thus ended the romantic venture of a German youth in the service of Dutch imperialism. Ever after, Heinzen warned his compatriots to shun Batavia and Dutch military service. He admitted that Java was one of nature's paradises, but he insisted that the Dutch had brought in the serpent and the fall of man. He maintained that Germans were discriminated against in the East Indies and that the Dutch were supernationalists, fired with a fanatical patriotism. He criticized their materialism and their "financial embonpoint." He described their language as a corruption of German, "like a German edition printed on blotting paper," and their literature as devoid of grace and aesthetic qualities. Indeed, it was in these early years that Heinzen actually advocated Holland's *Anschluss* with Germany,

though he made it clear that he would not favor the incorporation until the Germans had become a free people. In contrast with the Dutch, Heinzen had been favorably impressed by his contacts with the British, and particularly by their love of freedom and their parliamentary institutions. The English were "not cowardly dreamers like the Germans" or drunk with nationalism, and, in almost all respects, he found the Britishers superior to his own countrymen.

Strangely enough, the revolutionary movements of 1830 which began in France and swept over much of Europe while Heinzen was engrossed in his Batavian venture left the future revolutionist *par excellence* completely unmoved.

CHAPTER TWO

IN THE SERVICE OF HIS PRUSSIAN MAJESTY

KARL HEINZEN TOOK OFF THE UNIFORM OF THE Dutch foreign legion to don the uniform of His Majesty, the King of Prussia. Like all able-bodied young men of his age, he had to serve his time in the Prussian army. Having enjoyed certain educational advantages, he was held for one year only as an "einjähriger Freiwilliger." That he would react to the stiff routine and the rigid caste system of the military even less kindly than he had to those of the Gymnasium and the university might have been predicted. But from the army there was no escape. He served his year, without special distinction. There are bits of evidence that show that he carried his love of pranks into the army with him and that at times his conduct bordered dangerously near insubordination and disrespect for his superiors. He wrote—fifteen years after the event—that the fall of Warsaw and Poland, which occurred while he was in military service, made a deep and lasting impression on him, but one may well wonder whether this may not have been an afterthought.¹

Throughout the remainder of his life Heinzen wrote bitter and violent diatribes against militarism and war and all that they represented. These outbursts were no doubt inspired in great part by his personal contacts with the war machine while

¹ *Politische und unpolitische Fahrten und Abenteuer* (Mannheim, 1846), p. 197.

serving his year in the Prussian army. After his discharge from active service, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in a Landwehr regiment of reserves. His patent, issued to him under the royal seal, admonished Lieutenant Heinzen to serve his king ever after with courage, devotion, and obedience.

The most important event during Heinzen's year of military service, however, had nothing to do with Mars but a great deal with Cupid. It was as a Prussian soldier that he met the attractive young widow of Rittmeister Schiller, a veteran of the wars of liberation who had been garrisoned in Kleve from 1820 until his retirement in 1828. Luise Schiller was the daughter of Carl Joseph Moras, attorney and justice of the peace in Kleve. When Heinzen first saw her, she was already a widow, though still under thirty, and had four small children, the eldest but eight years of age.

What we know of Luise Schiller must be reconstructed largely from Heinzen's memoirs and from the fragments from her pen which he preserved among his manuscripts. Here she is revealed as a somewhat frivolous, vain, and coquettish young woman, moody and goodhearted. She had been reared by doting parents, who had spoiled their daughter by overindulgence. She loved to sing and dance, and she proved attractive to men at an early age. When she entered upon her marriage with Rittmeister Schiller, the lighthearted, romantic girl of seventeen apparently had little knowledge of the obligations of the marital relationship and found little happiness in them. It was not long before she began to confide to her diary that "woman is nothing more than the one who satisfies all of man's desires" and "the victim of the lust of men." "What rosy pictures I had of marriage," she continued, as she began to speculate on the possibilities of a divorce. But she postponed action because she did not wish to make her husband unhappy and because she believed their relationship would improve after the birth of their first child.

Luise bore her soldier-husband four children, but there is no

evidence that she found peace or happiness in her rapidly growing family. She became more moody and more coquettish. She yearned for amusement; she indulged in innocent flirtations with other men, and her diary revealed a growing desire to triumph over them, "for that is all they deserve." She found most men "vulgar" and as much like animals as women are like angels. In her restlessness she turned to religion, reflected on her sins, and went to confession, only to become resentful when the priest talked to her about the necessity of "triumphing over the flesh." After her friendship with Heinzen, she wrote more and more critically about religious matters. Church art she found terrible and somber; the fast days of the church she traced to Christ's desire to teach men to abstain. When her father threatened her with clerical penalties because of her love for Heinzen, she dismissed such threats as the irrational and outmoded survivals of earlier times.

After her death Heinzen laboriously copied many passages from Luise's diary and letter-books. She had burned her poems, which Heinzen regarded as the best revelation of her character. He resented the charge made by some of her friends that Luise was frivolous, lightheaded, and heartless. To him, she was natural and genuine, had "the soul of a child," and was grievously misunderstood. Heinzen undoubtedly exercised a great influence over Luise Schiller. But she made an even greater impression on him. There can be little doubt that, from this brief but extremely happy relationship with Luise, he derived many of the revolutionary views about the relation of the sexes and the position of woman in society which he propounded so vigorously ever after.

Heinzen told the story of his romance with Luise in his memoirs. They met at a ball, and he was so fascinated by her that he described her as so far surpassing all others in "spirit, beauty, and loveliness" as a commanding general's authority exceeds that of a lieutenant. The comely widow was discriminating in the bestowal of her favors, and Heinzen recounted

with delight the tale of her snubbing a dashing young lieutenant who asked her for a dance by retorting that she judged a book by its contents, not by its binding. Heinzen had seen his Luise a number of times before the fateful evening which settled their future. He respected her for her contempt of formality and convention, although she frequently criticized the impetuous young soldier for his disrespectful attitude toward the military. "A mere accident" brought them together for that final hour of conversation which settled Heinzen's fate and so deeply affected all the rest of his career. The ardent lover abandoned all his earlier plans to journey to America, Africa, or the Caucasus in order to remain with his lovely Luise. For the first time in his life he began making plans to earn a livelihood for the woman he loved and for her fatherless brood. For the love of a woman, he became a Prussian bureaucrat.

Luise Schiller had no earthly treasures except her beauty and her charm. It became Heinzen's responsibility to support her and her sizable family. Unfortunately, he had not completed his university studies, and he had neither a trade nor money. So, on leaving the army, and in his eagerness to establish a bourgeois home for the family he was about to annex, he resolved to prepare himself to become a tax official of Prussia. Whether he ever was officially married to Mme Schiller is of no great importance now and probably must remain a matter of some uncertainty. His closest friends in the United States, such as George Schumm, never referred to an actual marriage ceremony. Late in life, when Heinzen was revising and arranging his papers and publications for a definitive edition of his collected works, he struck out the word "love" (*Liebe*), in a passage referring to Luise Schiller, and wrote "affair" (*Verhältniss*) in pencil in the margin. It may be that Luise died before Heinzen could complete his plans to marry her and establish a home for her and her family. It has also been suggested that their relations may have been purely platonic during their long engagement. But, whether with or without benefit of clergy, there can be

no doubt that Luise Schiller brought genuine happiness into Heinzen's life during the short time she was left to him, nor can there be any question about his utter devotion to her children or about the family obligations which he had assumed because of his love for her.² Heinzen had thrown in his lot with her, in spite of his father's admonitions to reflect long and hard about his future and not be moved by passion and emotion. Like many another young lover, he wrote his father to cease giving advice, for a prosaic old man could not be expected to understand a poetic soul.

Heinzen, like some of his relatives before him, now began the arduous, slow climb up the ladder of Prussian bureaucratic preferment by applying for a position as a supernumerary in the tax department. This meant that he would have to serve for three years without a fixed, regular salary and would have to support himself, and his recently acquired family, from the commissions he collected and from a modest per diem allowance whenever he was assigned special duties.³ Heinzen failed the first two examinations largely because they were based on material which he was supposed to have mastered at the Gymnasium and much of which he had forgotten. Because of Luise, he resolved to get out his school books and to review their contents, and thus, a year and a half after he had made his first attempt to gain admission to the élite circle of Prussian civil servants, he passed the third examination. Thereafter, he had one more to pass—in mathematics, the subject which he hated most.

Heinzen's first assignment to duty was as a supernumerary or "extra" at the main tax office in Düsseldorf, where the chief officials were either relatives or friends of his parents.

² For a genealogy of the Schiller family see Richard Schiller's *Schiller-Pappritz-Trummer-Clemens—meine vier Urgrosseltern mit ihrer Nachkommenschaft* (Görlitz, 1915).

³ See *Erlebtes*, Part I: *Vor meiner Exilierung* (Boston, 1864), pp. 297 ff., and *Ein Stück Beamtenleben, oder staatsdienstliche Erfahrungen* (Herisau, 1846), the latter a 142-page supplement to his book on the Prussian bureaucracy.

The assignment was fortunate in another sense, for Luise Schiller lived in the country, just fifteen minutes' walk beyond the city. After a year and a half at Düsseldorf, Heinzen was promoted to Kleve, and his salary was fixed at 240 Prussian thaler a year. His duties involved issuing permits to those who wanted to trade in the town and stopping smuggling—an assignment which he found especially distasteful because it forced him to become a snooper and because he was expected to keep a percentage of the fines he collected.

It was while Heinzen was in Kleve that Luise died (August 15, 1835). She was thirty-two and Heinzen twenty-six at the time. When he asked for a week's furlough so that he might have a little time to recover from his bereavement, his request was rather curtly rejected. Heinzen had been deeply attached to the intelligent and beautiful woman whose lot he had resolved to share, and out of devotion to her memory, and from that sense of deep obligation to duty which was one of his dominant character traits, he without complaining assumed the heavy burden of supporting the four orphaned children whom fate had committed to his care. He wrote in 1838 to Berlin for a copy of the will of Luise's mother-in-law, only to find that no financial help was forthcoming from that source because her estate was small, and her family large, and Rittmeister Schiller had received practically all of his share during his lifetime. In spite of an inheritance of "a few thousand dollars" from his parents which came to him while he was stationed at Gummersbach, Heinzen's life from the time of Luise's death was one long battle with grinding poverty.

Luise's children grew to manhood and womanhood. Two of the daughters married Belgian pastors; the son became a businessman in Australia. In 1839 Heinzen married Luise's eldest daughter, Louise Henriette Ida Lisette, perhaps in accordance with the expressed desire of the mother. Henriette, as she was known thereafter, was then sixteen years old, her husband, thirty. In 1844 their only child, a son named Karl

Friedrich Maximilian Heinzen, was born in Aachen. In the bitter battles in the German-American press in later years, when Heinzen goaded so many of his journalistic colleagues into frantic rejoinders to his scathing and merciless attacks, his opponents frequently charged him with having "married his own daughter." All the available evidence shows that the Heinzens, in spite of the difference in their ages, enjoyed the usual allotment of happiness vouchsafed to most married couples who live together for most of a lifetime. Mrs. Heinzen willingly, and without complaint, followed her restless husband on all his many journeys; she supported him in all he did and shared all the hardships of his impecunious career; and she sacrificed unstintingly to help him wage his many battles for political and social reform.

For a man of Heinzen's stormy temperament and undisciplined nature, the post of a Prussian tax official proved to be nearly eight years of drudgery and torment. It was the experience of these eight years that eventually transformed him into a thoroughgoing revolutionary. He was irritated by the red tape of bureaucracy; he resented the long wait for promotions on the treadmill of Prussian officialdom; and he hated what he called the heartlessness and espionage of the Prussian system. He forced himself to perform his daily round of duties, but what he really wanted to do was to write. His interest had turned to literature, and he tried his hand at a book of lyrics, ballads, and some satirical comedies and wrote occasional contributions on music and belles-lettres for newspapers like the *Aachener Zeitung*, the *Leipziger Allgemeine*, the *Rheinische Zeitung*, and the *Mannheimer Abendzeitung*. He became more and more irritable as he realized that he had to make his living at a job which he despised, and he convinced himself that he was sacrificing genuine literary talents to the economic pressures of his sizable family.

Heinzen proved to be a rebellious and difficult subordinate. He did not fit into the orderly regimentation of the Prussian

hierarchy, and his written reports were frequently tactless and sarcastic. When his superiors wrote bad German style, he corrected them. He was called to task on a number of occasions for his unconventional reports, and he never took criticism kindly. He resented the "protection" and "pull" which some of his colleagues used in order to get ahead and the almost universal practice of lying in their official reports, in order to impress their superiors with exaggerated accounts of their devotion to duty. Heinzen claimed that he was censured for failing to do all that was expected of him simply because he made the reports of his daily activities entirely truthful. When he applied, after having served his apprenticeship, for a post as a "mounted tax inspector," his request was denied on the ground that he was not qualified. He easily convinced himself that he was not being appreciated and that he was "an Arabian steed hitched to a manure cart."

Nevertheless, Heinzen tried to do an honest job, inspecting cattle and collecting taxes from breweries and distilleries at Gummersbach, near Elberfeld, where he got his first real assignment. He worked hard, but he bitterly resented all efforts to supervise or check his work. He was never satisfied with any post to which he was assigned and felt that he deserved something better. The ten-hour day he found boring, and he had to spend five or six hours each day tramping, through wind and weather, along the country roads of his district. When he complained that it was too large to cover adequately and that the strain was impairing his health, his pleas for help remained unheeded. He lightened his spirits by composing verses as he trudged along over his district, and on one occasion he sent part of the manuscript of his Batavian adventure to his superiors in order to impress them with his qualifications for a better assignment. Though he had a heavy financial burden to carry and regarded his pay as unfairly low, he nevertheless spent part of his substance to get some of his writings published.

On one occasion Heinzen engaged in a sharp, sarcastic exchange

with his superiors about the relative advantages of literature and aesthetics as qualifications for tax-collecting, and he spoke most disparagingly of the intellectual caliber of those from whom he had to take orders. He got into a feud with the burgo-master of Gummersbach when the night watch disturbed his sleep, and that official thereupon proceeded to contribute petty items of complaint to the rapidly growing Heinzen dossier in the archives of the tax department. Particularly was he enraged by the Prussian practice which encouraged each official to send secret reports about his colleagues to his superiors, and later he publicly denounced these *Konduitenlisten* as devices intended to stir suspicion and to invite bootlicking in Prussian officialdom. He referred to his immediate chief, who had treated him fairly well, as "a despicable Judas" and seemed surprised when his ironic effusions made such an unfavorable impression. The time spent at Gummersbach was filled with petty complaints and friction, for which a large measure of responsibility must be charged to Heinzen himself.

In 1839 the tax-collector of Gummersbach was promoted to Elberfeld, at a salary increase of ten Prussian dollars a year, but Heinzen's economic burdens did not grow less hard to bear. It cost him more to live in this larger town, and by this time his little inheritance was almost spent. Tired, irascible, and staggering under mounting financial pressure, he penned a curious, provocative demand for further promotion and cited Juvenal and other classic sources to support his request. Worst of all, he made sarcastic references to those who have more in their legs than in their heads. It was obvious that Heinzen wanted to rest his legs and have time to use his head and his hand to produce more poems and satirical comedies and to finish his book on Batavia. In his official letter he described "the storm of fantasies rushing through [his] brain, the flute notes of the nightingale of poetry, and the turtledove of love." The muses who were torturing his brain with literary fantasies,

pressing to be born, did not prevent him from continuing his caricatures of Prussian officials and especially of the police.

It is an amazing fact, and it must be charged to the credit side of the ledger of Prussian office-holders, that, in spite of several sarcastic, unconventional, and disrespectful appeals to his superiors, Heinzen nevertheless was transferred within three months to the Cologne office, at a larger salary, to serve as a copyist and to have charge of the sugar tax. Almost immediately, the new appointee quarreled with a colleague and was charged with insubordination. So he was transferred anew to another bureau of the provincial tax supervisor, where he was given an accounting job. Figures had never been his forte, and he may have been assigned to the fiscal department "to see whether figures could restrain his poetic spirit." He revolted against the hateful assignment and after several months was shifted again to a post in the internal revenue division at headquarters in Cologne. Here he had a chance to prepare correspondence and to handle some legal cases and apparently won the praises of his chief for his style and his ability as a writer.

Shortly thereafter, Heinzen applied for the post of tax-collector in a town in the Mosel Valley, where the salary would have been large enough to give him a measure of economic security and a chance to nurse his ambitions as a literary man. The post was given to another. Instead of accepting the results, Heinzen indulged in a sharp correspondence which further jeopardized his reputation with the department. Thereupon he became ill. More specifically, he complained of hemorrhoids, which he attributed to having to sit at a desk so many hours a day. His doctor ordered him to take a cure at one of those baths from which Germans always expect such miraculous cures for whatever may ail them; but, when Heinzen asked for several weeks' sick leave, his request was refused because the doctor had not certified a total disability. This was the final straw, and in October, 1840, Heinzen resigned in a rage, after seven and a half years of service. His parting shot

was a long screed addressed to the minister of justice, which had no other result save to evoke a reply summarizing Heinzen's stormy record in the department and suggesting that he had too high a regard for his own abilities. Thereupon Heinzen addressed another document directly to the king of Prussia, complaining that he was the victim of injustice, making untactful comparisons between his talents and those of his fellow-officials and superiors, and ending with a request for a better job in another branch of the service. It is extremely doubtful whether his royal majesty of Prussia ever saw the appeal; but someone replied for him, rejecting the request, but leaving the door open to Heinzen to ask for other work in any other province to which he might like to go. The latter replied with another vigorous and somewhat petulant attack on tax officials in general and announced that he would not apply for another assignment. This time the chief of the tax division of the ministry of finance responded to the effect that further insulting letters addressed to the king would be turned over to the courts for prosecution.

Heinzen concluded that all his troubles as a Prussian official were to be explained on the basis of a conflict between his personality and individuality and a heartless, bureaucratic machine. He found support for his attitude in the fact that Robert Burns and Cervantes had also been tax-collectors! It should have been apparent to him much earlier that the work was utterly incompatible with his temperament and that he considered himself too good for his assignments. Heinzen concluded that there was no place for a "free personality" under a bureaucratic system and that the battle between an individual and Prussian officialdom was hopeless from the outset. Far more significant, in the light of things to come, was his comment that the Prussian bureaucracy was primarily a means to enslave the people in the interest of an absolute monarchy, which sought to reduce every independent act to a "state function."

The onetime tax official quickly discovered that it was im-

possible to make a living from the products of his pen and the creations of his literary imagination, although he was particularly fruitful at this time both in the field of journalism and in belles-lettres. So Heinzen accepted employment in 1841 as executive secretary of the Rhine railway, with offices in Cologne, and at a salary of four hundred thaler annually. At the request of the Cologne-Belgian railway management, he wrote a lyric about railroading, which the company refused to publish because the last stanza contained the word *allons*, which apparently was too suggestive of French republicanism.

From his post with the railway Heinzen moved on to become secretary of the fire insurance company at Aachen, at seven hundred thaler. In both positions his work seems to have been entirely satisfactory, and he carefully preserved among his papers the testimonials furnished by his superiors along with similar documents from the *Landrath* of Gummersbach and the burgomaster of Kleve. It was in the office at Aachen that Heinzen put the finishing touches on his exposé of the Prussian bureaucracy. The president of the company tried to persuade him not to publish it, but a man of Heinzen's combative nature could not be deterred. He resigned, moved to Cologne, and sent the manuscript to the printer. The reaction of the Prussian authorities was sufficiently sharp to start Heinzen on his first long exile from his fatherland. But there is no evidence that Heinzen was as yet really a thoroughgoing, uncompromising revolutionist. He had definitely broken with his erstwhile friends, the Communists on the *Rheinische Zeitung*, and he still believed in legal, peaceful methods of reform. He rejected force and violence and, in religious discussions, still spoke of a "First Cause."

Before *Die preussische Bureaukratie* actually saw the light of day, Heinzen had published some political papers dealing with contemporary problems in the *Leipziger Allgemeine* and the *Rheinische Zeitung*, and several of these had attracted the notice of the Prussian censors. In 1842 he issued a small pamphlet on

the secret *Konduitenliste* of the Prussian civil service.⁴ The fifteen-page brochure was a head-on attack on the secret reports which civil servants were expected to make to their superiors about their colleagues, who obviously had no chance to correct the statements made about them or to defend themselves against misrepresentation. Heinzen denounced the procedure, in the devastating language which he could use so effectively, primarily because it deprived the subject of the ordinary rights of judicial procedure and encouraged fawning and hypocrisy in the relationship between subordinates and their chiefs. He contended that if it were necessary to preserve the system of reports, their secret character should be abolished, and the accused should receive a copy and should have free access to the personal file kept about him. Far more important than these specific criticisms of a long-established administrative procedure were the author's comments about the whole Prussian state system. He called for free speech and an end of censorship, advocated a bureaucracy based on "honor, truth, and justice," and pleaded for a new day in Prussia which would bring an end to the "military state," "maintained by a standing army of soldiers and a sitting army of civil servants."

On July 26, 1843, Heinzen issued the last of several appeals in the Cologne newspapers for contributions to help him publish his projected treatise on the Prussian administrative system. The appeal was addressed to all friends of progress, and the prospective author promised not to reveal the names of contributors and issued a short prospectus of his forthcoming book. A contract was signed with W. Leske of Darmstadt for an edition of three thousand copies, the author to receive a dozen free copies and a small honorarium. Arrangements were made to have the book appear simultaneously in a number of places in order to outwit the censor, and there is ample evidence in the Preface to show that Heinzen expected to be

⁴ *Die geheime Konduitenlisten der Beamten: Eine Flugschrift von Karl Heinzen* (Cologne, 1842).

prosecuted and was fully prepared to plead free speech in his defense. The Prussian government had been watching for this assault on one of the citadels of its power and actually prohibited the circulation of the book several months before it came from the press. On November 11, 1844, it reached the book-dealers of Cologne. The next day the police hunted for it in all the bookstalls and forced its price up as a consequence. On November 13 the author was summoned to appear in court. His book received review notices in Cologne and elsewhere, and the government's efforts at suppression only served to stimulate its circulation, though it never made a great popular appeal.

Die preussische Bureaukratie, dated Darmstadt, 1845, was a slashing attack on the Prussian administration and a forthright and honest plea for a constitutional monarchy and popular representation. Its language was daring and provocative, to say the least, but its author was proud of his work—so proud that he reprinted the book in its entirety as late as 1875 in his Boston *Pionier*. Heinzen branded the Prussian bureaucracy as a tool of absolutism and reaction, and he did not spare the royal family itself. He declared czarist Russia, rather than France, the real support of the German autocratic states and the greatest enemy of freedom. He called upon men of character and courage to join him in advocating the eventual establishment of a republic, after a short transition period of limited, constitutional monarchy, and he maintained that in a republic a large administrative hierarchy would be superfluous because there would be more individual freedom, no censor, and fewer police, and a chance to direct the course of events by popular, representative government.

It may be that Heinzen expected a state trial in which he might play the role of the hero who defends the people against their oppressors, but events turned out otherwise. On the day following the order for his arrest and the summons to appear in court, Heinzen, apparently on the advice of several of his

friends, boarded a train at Düren, about halfway between Cologne and Aachen, crossed over into Holland, and then went on to Belgium. He left a letter behind, addressed to the judge, in which he explained his departure and promised to return to stand trial, provided he were guaranteed his liberty until the hearing could be completed and final judgment pronounced. A statement sent to the *Kölnische Zeitung* was suppressed by the censor.

Two days later, a "Steckbrief," ordering Heinzen's arrest wherever he might be found and branding him as a fugitive from justice, was published in a number of German papers.⁵ He was charged with stirring up dissension among the citizens against their government, and, later, Berlin added the charge of lèse majesté, because of a reference in the publication to a deceased Prussian monarch. To this Heinzen made the rejoinder that even a bon mot about Adam in Paradise might be regarded as an insult to the reigning king, for undoubtedly Adam spoke Hohenzollern and was put on earth solely to produce His Prussian Majesty.⁶

The addition of the charge of lèse majesté was significant, for it implied a secret instead of a public trial and convinced Heinzen that he could not risk a return to Germany. He issued a dramatic "farewell to Prussia," the land of bureaucracy and despotism, police and censorship, and, for good measure, he addressed the senate of the Cologne Court of Appeals, accusing them of judicial cowardice in failing to seize upon the opportunity which he had provided them to pit the system of justice prevailing in the Rhineland against the autocracy of Berlin.

Other publications followed, in a mounting tone of violence, identifying Prussianism with "Protestant Jesuitism." Heinzen analyzed the law under which he was arraigned, frankly proclaimed his desire to stir up dissatisfaction but denied

⁵ See "Ein Steckbrief," in Heinzen's *Teutsche Revolution* (Bern, 1847), pp. 1-15.

⁶ Heinzen, *Ein Steckbrief* (Schärbeek: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1845), p. 26.

fomenting revolution, and wrote an excellent historical discussion of Prussianism.⁷ He charged the regime with flirting with czarist Russia and at the same time prating piously about German unity as the champion of the German states. He pointed to the absence of social legislation in Prussia, to the burden of taxation in order to support a military state, and to the shooting-down in cold blood of starving Silesian weavers. Thus, he had advanced to the position of denouncing the whole system of absolute monarchy and divine right of kings, in which the altar was used to support the throne. Prussia had become, in his mind, the symbol of feudal and medieval obscurantism and absolutism, of intrigue, police, censorship, and broken promises.

Heinzen issued a series of articles, some of which will be examined later, under the title, *Mehr als zwanzig Bogen*, in defense of his conduct in his conflict with the Prussian courts. From then on, his propaganda for republicanism never ceased. His style became more and more forceful, not to say coarse, belligerent, and offensive, but there cannot be the slightest doubt about his sincerity. He convinced himself that he, almost singlehanded, could demonstrate that the pen was mightier than the sword, and that one unrelenting, forthright, uncompromising pamphleteer might be enough to rock the Prussian state to its very foundations. Obviously, each new outburst made his return to his beloved Rhineland more and more impossible. Heinzen burned his bridges behind him as he entered upon his long exile. He never set foot on his native soil again save during the brief interval of the revolution of 1848-49. Nor did he ever serve the six-month jail sentence which was imposed against him on February 10, 1845, by the court in Cologne.

⁷ "Meine (vorläufige) Vertheidigung," republished in *Mehr als zwanzig Bogen* (Darmstadt, 1845).

CHAPTER THREE

THE MAKING OF A REVOLUTIONARY

HEINZEN CROSSED THE DUTCH BORDER ON FOOT and traveled on to Liège and Brussels. He read with delight what the Cologne papers had to say about his escape, and presently he returned to Dolhaim nearer the border to get a letter from his wife, who had remained behind in Germany. He decided to remain there for a brief period, stopping at the Hôtel des Pays-Bas, so that he might finish his *Mehr als zwanzig Bogen* and send it to Darmstadt to be printed by the same publisher who had issued his attack on the Prussian bureaucracy.

On his return to Brussels, Heinzen met quite an assembly of refugees and fellow-sufferers from state police and censors. Among them were Ferdinand Freiligrath, soon to be known as the "trumpeter of the revolution" of 1848, although he had not always been a champion of popular liberties.¹ With Freiligrath, in spite of an inauspicious beginning, Heinzen developed an affectionate friendship which he cherished for the rest of his days. Karl Marx was there also. He had recently received his Ph.D. degree at Jena at the age of twenty-three for a thesis entitled "The Materialistic Philosophy of Epicurus and Its Theological Criticism by Plutarch." Girl trouble, financial difficulties, and various intellectual and emotional disturbances

¹ For a more detailed account of Heinzen's relations with the poet see Carl Wittke, "Freiligrath and Heinzen," in *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht* (Madison, Wis.), XXXIV (1942), 425-35.

and experiences drove this philosophical offspring of Hegelianism into revolutionary radicalism and kept him out of a professor's chair. Marx took the Hegelian "Idea" and transformed it into an economic, materialistic interpretation of history which became and has remained the underlying concept of communism. Heinzen before long developed a cordial dislike for the prophet of the proletarian revolution, and it was in Brussels that he and Marx began their lifelong debate about the proper methods and objectives of political and social reform. Heinrich Bürgers, another Communist, also was a member of the little discussion group. Next to Freiligrath, Heinzen admired Joachim Lelewel, a Polish refugee from Russian despotism. He was a man of noble features and beautiful character who lived and died in miserable poverty and who dressed like a workman, in Polish cap and blue jacket, and lived in an unheated attic room where he worked on his treatise on Polish heraldry. Sixteen years later, when Lelewel died penniless in Paris at the age of seventy-five, Heinzen wrote a moving tribute to his memory in the *Pionier*.

It was the custom of this coterie of refugees and reformers in Brussels to gather frequently during the winter of 1844-45 in the coffee-house, "Faillie Déchirée," and to meet at each other's houses. Marx and Freiligrath had their families with them, and on New Year's Eve, 1844, Mrs. Heinzen joined her exiled husband at a gay party at the Freiligrath apartment. The refugees wrote revolutionary pamphlets and smuggled them across the border into Germany in order to furnish new ammunition for the struggle against the forces of reaction. Heinzen described his Belgian experiences in his memoirs in a rollicking, romantic vein and drew heavily on his imagination in order to make an interesting story.

Heinzen did not feel culturally and spiritually at home in Belgium. He was delighted to find the Parliament House at the capital more beautiful than the royal palace, and he described it as "popular sovereignty in stone." The cosmopolitan atmos-

phere of Antwerp delighted him, and once again he had difficulty in resisting the lure of the sea. But he also complained of too many soldiers and priests in Belgium and of the restrictions on travel due to police regulations. Heinzen was handicapped by his poor speaking knowledge of French, though he read it quite well, and he was disappointed to find that the Belgian newspapers devoted more space to British and French, than to German, news. On the whole, his opinion of the country that had given him refuge was not unfavorable, primarily because it was a free country, though in the orbit of France. He denounced the Flemish national movement and Prussia's attempts to encourage it. He was not impressed by Belgian literature, however, and Belgian women he described as "an unfortunate blend of Dutch materialism and French fire." Brussels he likened to a "beautiful body without a soul." It was full of philistines who sat in the beerhouses smoking tobacco and eating potato chips, about on the level of the Bavarians in Munich.

Heinzen had already discovered the refugee psychology. "Persecution behind him, distrust and suspicion ahead, at best, a benevolent hospitality awaiting him," trying to rescue himself, trying to re-establish himself, and trying to avoid giving offense—thus Heinzen described the feelings of the homeless refugee class of which he had now become a permanent member. The refugees, he observed, were engaged in trying to salvage their personalities, their honor, their independence, and their self-respect. They were without protection, because they were strangers; they were without credit, because they were transients; they had few or no rights, because they were aliens. "Not to be robbed or murdered—these negative rights are all he [the refugee] can count upon. . . . The greatest bitterness in the life of a refugee arises from the fact that he is living on sufferance everywhere. Will he be tolerated? That is the eternal question."²

² *Politische und unpolitische Fahrten und Abenteuer* (Mannheim, 1846), II, 323–26.

Prussian diplomatic pressure steadily increased on Belgium for harboring her refugees, and so Freiligrath and Heinzen resolved to seek asylum in Switzerland—then, as now, a haven of refuge for the exiles of many lands. After a last convivial evening at the lodgings of Karl Marx, the two friends left Brussels on March 12, 1845, by stagecoach, for the promised land of free speech. The trip proved to be a hard one, through winter cold and deep snow, but it was not unrelieved by pleasant, jolly adventures and bottles of native Lorraine wine. The road lay over icy terrain through Nancy and the Ardennes, to the French border. The two friends traveled as far as Strassburg together, then Freiligrath went on alone to Switzerland. Heinzen was not much impressed by either Metz or Strassburg, but he did climb the Münster tower in the latter city to look out on the Vosges Mountains and to the other side of the Rhine and to recall that Voltaire and Goethe had sat there before him.

When Heinzen arrived in Zurich, Freiligrath was there to greet him. Their families joined them, and an extremely cordial relationship developed between them. Heinzen was in ecstasy over the Alpine republic, and with his poet friend he made several trips through the beautiful lake and mountain country. He characterized Zurich as an altogether charming and perfect blend of the best that Germany and Italy together had to offer. The beauty of the Lake of Zurich, the Alps towering in the distance, the peace and joy of his own garden, and the friendliness of the Swiss people made Heinzen a new man. He was carried away by the imposing grandeur and the overpowering majesty of the mountains, and he prophesied that some day they would be the "way stations for the journeys man will make above the earth." He philosophized that "the earth, and all therein, exists only for man. Were there no human beings, there could be no world, just as there could be no plants without blossoms and fruit." Heinzen admired the democratic Swiss military system based on the universal obligation of a people in arms; he was deeply impressed by the interest the

Swiss people took in their politics; and he defended them vigorously against the libel and misrepresentation of German officials and journalists. The early months of his Swiss sojourn constituted one of the truly happy periods in Heinzen's life. In this atmosphere of beauty and relative freedom, he completed his evolution into a thorough and complete revolutionary.

Switzerland, at the time, harbored many interesting refugees—German, Polish, French, and Italian. Julius Fröbel, nephew of the well-known educational leader, lived in Zurich. The city was the publishing center for Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Ludwig Seeger, and Ludwig Feuerbach.³ Franz Liszt and Bayard Taylor visited Freiligrath in Zurich. Arnold Ruge, freethinker, Neo-Hegelian philosopher, and founder of the "Loge des Humanismus," was there also and apparently exercised a profound influence on Heinzen's thought.

The author of the treatise on the Prussian bureaucracy quickly came to the conclusion that it was his duty to flood Germany with revolutionary pamphlets, couched in sufficiently strong language to shake the German people out of their lethargy. With Ruge, Heinzen launched the short-lived *Die Opposition*, a propaganda quarterly in the interests of republicanism and atheism, and secured as contributors such literary lights as Freiligrath, Fröbel, and Georg Herwegh, the irrepressible romantic and revolutionary poet whom Heine once called the "iron lark," and about whose affairs and the antics of his beautiful wife Mrs. Heinzen exchanged delicious bits of gossip with her friends. *Die Opposition* met an early death, but Heinzen immediately launched another revolutionary sheet, *Der Deutsche Tribün*, and it was this publication which eventually brought about his expulsion from Switzerland.

Needless to say, Heinzen was in straitened circumstances during the entire period of his residence in the Alpine republic,

³ See Werner Näf, *Die Schweiz in der deutschen Revolution* (Leipzig, 1929); Wilhelm Marr, *Das junge Deutschland in der Schweiz* (Leipzig, 1846); and Emil Ermatinger, *Gottfried Kellers Leben* (Stuttgart, 1924), Vol. I.

and he was supported in large measure by contributions from fellow-radicals and sympathizers in Germany and the United States. Funds were collected for his pamphleteering activities in Mannheim, Darmstadt, and other German cities; and in 1846, through the efforts of Freiligrath, money was raised in America by Wilhelm von Eichthal, the publisher of the New York *Deutsche Schnellpost*. In the unpublished Freiligrath-Heinzen correspondence there are numerous references to contributions from New York of \$60, \$100, and other amounts, and to money orders drawn on the Bank of England. It is apparent that Heinzen's name was becoming known among the liberal Germans not only in New York but in Philadelphia, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and other centers of the German immigration.

Heinzen managed to interrupt his strenuous pamphleteering activities frequently enough to enable him to remember with pleasure the days he had spent in Switzerland. With Freiligrath, he made a trip to the Walensee, and a foot tour to Glarus. He wrote animated descriptions of these excursions, but he stubbornly refused to wax romantic about the castles of Switzerland, which he said had been built by freebooters, or about its prayer stations, erected by monks. He made a trip to Rapperswyl, on the Lake of Zurich, where Freiligrath lived in a charmingly situated summer house. By canoe, the budding revolutionary, who as a young man had been such an admirer of Napoleon that he regretted he had not been born a German, made a pilgrimage, alone, to Ufnau, the burial place of Ulrich von Hutten, one of the few objects of Heinzen's hero worship. He spent a whole day on the island, communing with the spirit of a fellow-refugee of an earlier century; he fished, drank the good *Klosterwein*, and wrote a poem, dedicated to Hutten. That poem contained lines which deserve to be quoted, because they apply so well to Heinzen's own long, lone battle with tyranny and hypocrisy.

Und sollt es brechen vor dem End,
Nie werd ich von der Wahrheit lassen!
Das war das stolze Testament
Das uns der Todte hinterlassen.

.
Der Wahrheit bleib ich treu, wie du
Wenn ich, wie du, auch "brechen" werde.

The poem was first printed in the first and only issue of Heinzen's *Völkerbund*, in New York, and then was reprinted in the last issue of his ill-fated *New Yorker Deutsche Zeitung* on December 4, 1851.

It was inevitable that Heinzen should turn out to be an embarrassing visitor in the various Swiss cantons in which he tarried, though the chief official of one of them gave him a testimonial of exemplary conduct. His relentless pamphleteering and the numerous controversies he carried on in unbridled language with some of his fellow-refugees, as well as with the forces of reaction outside Switzerland, finally led to difficulties with the authorities, and he began to be pushed about from canton to canton, from Zurich to Basel to Bern to Geneva, and, finally, out of Switzerland altogether. An analysis of his publications and of the steady development of his thinking toward out-and-out revolution, tyrannicide, anticlericalism, and atheism may well be left to a later point in this narrative. His expulsion from one place to another was usually attributed to some specific incident, but, in truth, it was rather the accumulation of a series of events and activities which led canton after canton to rid itself of a troublesome and stormy visitor.

In Zurich, as already suggested, Heinzen's quarterly, *Die Opposition*, dedicated to atheism and republicanism, died with the first issue. But Heinzen's revolutionary pamphlets were published in Bern, Zurich, Herisau, Birsfelden, and elsewhere and were circulated by all sorts of devices among the book-sellers of Wiesbaden, Frankfurt, Kassel, Hanau, Giessen, Mar-

burg, Mainz, Stuttgart, Ulm, Munich, Nuremberg, Tübingen, and other German cities. Money to finance the enterprise was raised by the aged Baron von Itzstein, leader of the constitutional opposition in Baden and a man of large possessions; by H. Simon of Breslau; by Robert Blum, who had important connections in Leipzig; and by other sympathizers. Heinzen managed to earn about fifteen hundred thaler by his literary activities during his first year in exile, but such sources of income were quickly dried up, and he had to draw on the contributions received for the publication of his propaganda leaflets in order to support his large family—a procedure which led to ugly charges that he was misappropriating funds and living “on oysters and champagne.”

Heinzen's first permit to live in Switzerland was limited to six months. When it was renewed, it was suggested that Heinzen refrain thereafter from his attacks on Prussia. He immediately rejected this limitation of his freedom of action and contended that the right to asylum did not mean “silent asylum.” He was willing to accept full legal responsibility for his writings, and he agreed not to circulate his publications in Zurich if the local authorities considered them objectionable; but he would accept no other restrictions and insisted on his right to smuggle his literary products into Germany and to have them published and circulated there.

The crisis finally came when the Zurich officials took offense at two anonymous articles which had appeared in *Der Deutsche Tribün*. One was an address to Itzstein in Germany, the other an appeal to the Germans in the United States. Heinzen always maintained that pressure from Prussia and Bavaria forced the cantonal government to take action against him, although responsible Swiss, like the poet, Gottfried Keller, maintained that Heinzen's own impractical and tactless conduct had made expulsion unavoidable.⁴ Heinzen was summoned

⁴ Keller to Freiligrath, February 5, 1847, in Ermatinger, *op. cit.*, II, 134-35.

by the Zurich police and readily admitted authorship of the articles under attack. Swiss papers like the *Neue Züricher Zeitung* and the *Eidgenössische Zeitung* accused Heinzen of shamefully abusing the privileges of asylum, and the latter replied that a refugee should be subject to local law, like any citizen, but no more. He drew a careful distinction between peaceful persuasion and overt acts of violence and contrasted the right of asylum granted in England, France, and Belgium with the restricted rights offered him in Switzerland. When the police confiscated copies of the *Tribün* in his rooms, Heinzen offered to move on to Baselland. He was ordered out of Zurich on December 15, 1846, as an advocate of sedition and tyrannicide, and he maintained ever after that most of the troubles he encountered in other cantons were attributable to the reports which the Zurich police sent to these local authorities.

Heinzen stopped in Basel, only to be told that he would not be welcome there. A package of his publications which had been carelessly mailed fell into the hands of the Basel police and was burned. The revolutionary pamphleteer moved on to Bern and again was refused asylum. Throughout the winter of 1847 he moved from place to place until he reached Geneva, where he was able to remain incognito for some time. Here he lived with his family in rented rooms in an isolated house on beautiful Lake Geneva, which was the home of Albert Galeer, a teacher of German, and a mild-mannered but incorruptible revolutionist. Galeer had a strong following among the workers. He was a noble spirit, a member of the Geneva Council, and the good angel for many a refugee. Heinzen counted him among his best friends and always referred to him, and to the publisher Jenni of Bern, as the only genuine revolutionaries and cosmopolites he had encountered among the Swiss. Jenni published many an incendiary and seditious pamphlet and in his final months on earth cheered his enemies by publishing pic-

tures of himself each week in his paper, the *Guckkasten*, to show his steady decline from the ravages of tuberculosis.⁵

In Geneva, as elsewhere, Heinzen remained the object of newspaper attacks by some of the leading Swiss and German papers. He accused the Communists of circulating false tales about him, to the effect that he was living the life of luxury of a typical bourgeois. In Germany Prussian and Bavarian police continued to threaten the booksellers who dared to offer Heinzen's publications for sale, and life in Geneva became more precarious and difficult. Obviously, the time had come to seek a new home and a new means of support for himself and his family. In July, 1846, Freiligrath had gone to England to seek a job which would support his wife and the child born to them in Switzerland. Because of his practical training in business and accounting, he had found employment in London with the house of Friedrich Huth and Company, after the Rothschilds had refused to take him lest they offend the government of Prussia, with whom Freiligrath was distinctly *persona non grata*. In London the poet of the revolution worked long hours over his account-books, and his wife did needlework and tutored English children, but their combined income was so discouragingly inadequate that the family considered migrating to the United States.

Heinzen reflected seriously on the same solution for his difficulties. The Freiligraths in London and the Heinzens in Switzerland had carried on a lively and extremely friendly correspondence. Heinzen carefully preserved Freiligrath's letters in his chest of personal papers. His poet friend had helped to introduce him to the Germans of the United States, and Heinzen always maintained that the liberal-minded German immigrants in America were awakened to an interest in the possibilities of a German revolution by the poems of Herwegh and Freiligrath and by his own political brochures which

⁵ See Heinzen's *Meine Ausweisung aus Zürich* (Bern, 1847).

Freiligrath sent to Eichthal, the editor of the *Deutsche Schnellpost* in New York.

Eichthal came to know Heinzen through some of the latter's contributions to the *Deutsche Zeitung*, published by the Duke of Brunswick in London, primarily to irritate his fellow German princes. The New York editor liked Heinzen's literary efforts so well that he wrote for more to Freiligrath in London and raised funds in Cincinnati, St. Louis, New York, and elsewhere to support Heinzen's activities. Freiligrath also corresponded with Dr. George F. Seidensticker, a German revolutionist of 1830, who edited the *Bürgerfreund* and the *Demokrat* in Philadelphia, and solicited contributions from Heinzen, Freiligrath, and von Fallersleben for his papers. At a mass meeting held late in 1846 in St. Louis in response to a call in the *Anzeiger des Westens* to raise money for the German liberal cause, the Germans of that city specifically singled out the work of Freiligrath, Heinzen, and Herwegh for special commendation.⁶ Heinzen received personal letters from a number of St. Louis Germans who knew of him primarily through the *Schnellpost*, and it is clear that Heinzen's activities were known to many Germans in the United States before he arrived in New York.

As Heinzen pondered his future in his house on the shores of Lake Geneva, he might well have asked: "Should it be England or America?" Freiligrath's advice proved decisive. He wrote regularly from London, inclosing money forwarded from the United States; he advised his friend how to convert these funds into local exchange most advantageously; he requested more manuscripts for Eichthal in New York and sent Heinzen copies of the *Deutsche Schnellpost*; he described his life among the refugees in England, and his meetings with Bulwer, Tennyson, Ruge, Mazzini, and others, and wrote of all the little family details that are of interest to close friends. Freiligrath instructed

⁶ See "Unpublished Letters of Ferdinand Freiligrath to Dr. George F. Seidensticker," in *Americana Germanica*, I, 74-87; and Heinzen MSS.

Heinzen how to book passage for America and advised him to stay away from England, where prices were high and the lot of the penniless refugee hard indeed.

In December, 1847, Heinzen embarked for the United States. He sailed from Havre. His original plan was to travel steerage, as Freiligrath had suggested, but he was able to get better accommodations at the last moment because of contributions he received from French admirers. He left his family behind him as a charge upon the generosity and kindness of his friends. The trip was financed largely by funds raised by Ruge and Iztstein in Germany, by contributions from the United States, and by a few hundred francs collected in Paris. The Atlantic passage, and Heinzen's experiences on his arrival in New York, where he immediately attracted great attention among the German-American group, will be described later. His original intention was to stay only long enough to conduct a lecture tour to secure funds which he could take back to Europe. The outbreak of the Revolution of 1848 completely altered his program.

Before following Heinzen's fortunes further, it is necessary to turn back for an analysis of his political and economic thinking, as it had developed in the years following the publication of his *Prussian Bureaucracy*. A discussion of his religious views may well be left to a later chapter, although the main tenets of Heinzen's personal philosophy were fairly well established by the time he left Switzerland, and comparatively little was added or modified during the rest of his lifetime. His political and social views may best be gleaned from an analysis of his more important publications, which he assembled in two volumes, entitled *Mehr als zwanzig Bogen* (Darmstadt, 1845) and *Teutsche Revolution: Gesammelte Flugschriften* (Bern, 1847).

The first of these volumes is a miscellany of very uneven importance. It contains essays on the autonomous rights of the Rhenish nobility, on the processes by which a noble may be degraded to a commoner, and on bureaucracy in general. Heinzen sharply criticized the obsequious royalist nobility

in the Rhineland and contrasted it with the magnanimity of the leaders of the French Revolution, who had vied with each other in surrendering their feudal privileges. In ironical and even ribald style he told the story of "the death of the bureaucrats," who met in fierce battle around the green table because one of their number had insisted that two and two make four, instead of twenty-five, and who finally were buried in coffins shaped like ink bottles, in which they descended to hell, where they found, to their amazement, neither censorship nor secret reports on their colleagues. The fantastic tale glows with hatred for the bureaucracy. Another contribution described the "Feast of the Knights at Godesburg," with parades, feasting, and huge patriotic illuminations, which reflected more light than nobles had ever been known to give off before! Heinzen suggested improving the breed of the aristocracy by large admixtures of plebeian blood and predicted the day would come when one book publisher would be sufficient to end the entire medieval system of noble birth and special privilege. In an article on "Political Romanticism" he chronicled the events that had led to his exile, described his life in Belgium, and thanked the citizens of Cologne who had helped him to escape. He ended his essay with the pleasantry, "*Dulce est pro patria mori; dulcius pro patria vagabundum esse.*"

The one essay in this collection which deserves more detailed analysis was entitled "*Ein Wort über erlaubten Widerstand.*" In it Heinzen set forth his views on revolutions and proclaimed his fundamental conviction that the days of the infallible state and the infallible church were numbered and that the conflict between reaction and reform could not be confined within national boundaries but must become a universal struggle, for no nation could live to itself alone. Heinzen went so far as to say that he would welcome Germany's absorption by France, if that were the only way to free the German people, and he boldly stated his preference for a foreign nation that is free rather than for a fatherland which holds its people in

slavery. He likened revolution to a fever in the human body, by which the organism sloughed off its poisons at any cost and even at the risk of death. But he still shrank from assuming responsibility for such a drastic, and perhaps fatal, purging of the body politic. He cautioned earnestly against the appeal to force unless the reactionaries themselves made it inevitable. "True freedom is so pure and divine," he wrote, "that its champions may and must use, but never precipitate, a revolution," for revolution is a "chaos of lawlessness, crime, and passion." He charged the terror of the French Revolution to the despots who made it necessary; and he feared that a German revolution would be far worse, in bloodshed and destruction, and might easily degenerate into anarchy, which in turn would be followed by still worse reaction.

Heinzen concluded with an appeal for patience and self-restraint and apparently still believed that a revolution of the German states could be avoided. He referred frequently to a middle ground of justice and truth. It is wrong to look for liberty "only through the telescope of revolution," he wrote; more courage and power are needed to make a revolution unnecessary than to bring it on. Justice begets justice, and violence begets violence. He appealed for the development of men of genuine morality and unselfish devotion to liberty, who might point the way to "lawful evolution" and use "the sword of the spirit in the hand of moral force." Heinzen urged the German press to teach the people the "language of English Parliamentarians," to abandon its sycophancy, and to appeal to truth and courage, which will prove "as infectious as fear." He appealed to the journalists to cease giving publicity to public festivals and state ceremonies, so that, by a policy of silent treatment and "passive resistance," the common people might be weaned from their love for the trappings of monarchy. He denounced nationalism, "the cloak of a lackey," and was especially critical of the silly, artificially stimulated hatred of the French. He called upon his countrymen to honor their western neighbors

instead and to borrow generously from their superior institutions. "To hate the French is servile ignorance," he wrote; and he advised turning German national hatreds against Russia, the home of slavery and despotism. He demanded a re-examination of the claims of the church, whose priests he regarded as the henchmen of reactionary monarchy and as policemen who sought to suppress the appeal to reason. Be religious if you wish, he told his readers, but do not thereby become the tool of political reaction! True religion, Heinzen maintained, was primarily concerned with truth, justice, and freedom. He advised the newspapers to boycott the churches, save when they exposed and combated their abuses, and he appealed for popular contributions for books and a free press rather than for torchlight processions, monuments, decorations, and titles. His appeal was couched in reasonable, tolerant, moderate terms and was practically free from the unnecessary abuse which characterized so many of his later writings.

The essays collected under the title of *Teutsche Revolution* reveal, on the whole, a more radical, revolutionary attitude and a style more suggestive of the powerful invective which made their author's later journalistic efforts so unique. Heinzen announced in the Preface that he intended to say all that was in his heart, without consideration for anything except complete truth. "Be what you are, and be it whole, or send a bullet through your head. . . . I want to be a free, frank, true, whole person." In an essay entitled "Open the Floodgates" he proclaimed that the time had come to write without restraint, for conditions in Germany made normal argument and discussion no longer feasible. Practically every chapter of the *Teutsche Revolution* was a vigorous attack on Prussianism and on the "thirty-four German slave-drivers," "crowned ne'er-do-wells and good-for-nothings," who sat upon their feudal thrones and exploited the people of a disunited fatherland. Heinzen was through with moderation. He called for revenge, for swords and bullets, for an end to the despotic police states which were

the pawns of Prussia and Austria. The time for petitions had passed. Heinzen referred to Frederick William IV of Prussia as a fool, a Jesuitical despot, common "vermin," the symbol of a regime that "begins with hypocrisy and ends with force." He insisted that there was better human stuff in the huts of beggars and in the humble homes of the workers than in all the palaces of the German kings. He called for revolution, for a federal republic, and for a united Germany.

Heinzen examined the whole system of Prussian Junker repression as it operated in the press, in the universities, and through the taxes saddled upon the poor. He preferred Bavaria's Catholicism to the perfidious, hypocritical Protestantism of Berlin, and he called upon his native Rhineland and the South German states to block Prussia's sinister schemes to dominate all of Germany by her military power and her influence in the German *Bund*. He reviewed in detail Prussia's plan to expel Austria from German affairs, to acquire hegemony over Germany, and to unify the fatherland under the Hohenzollern dynasty. He mercilessly dissected the character of Frederick William IV in order to expose his pietism as a cloak for reaction and his hypocritical pose in advertising Prussia as "the center of German culture." He chided the people for their servility and loyalty to the throne; he called upon them to end their "stereotyped nonsense" and "self-effacing genuflections" and to revolt against all the old ritual about "throne and people" by which man's spirit had been enslaved and a whole nation had been degraded. He pointed to liberty-loving Englishmen by way of contrast and demanded reduction of the army, relief from heavy taxation, universal suffrage, regular audits of the royal exchequer, social reforms, free education, and a break with Russia. Heinzen foresaw that the problem of the future would involve the absorption of Prussia into a larger, united Germany. "A free Prussia will create a strong Germany; a strong Prussia will become a traitor to Germany."

Heinzen had become an avowed republican, but he did not

yet demand a republic for Prussia, at least not immediately. He would have been satisfied, as a first step, with a new constitution which would carry out the reforms indicated above. But he believed that it was written in the book of destiny that the monarch on his throne must finally yield to the tribune of the republic. He was convinced that "the yeast is set and the bread must be baked." The only question that remained unanswered was whether reform would come by humane or by brutal means, and Heinzen clearly preferred the former to bloodshed. He stated these convictions in a statesman-like document, with a minimum of personalities and abuse, and with keen power of analysis.

Another of his appeals to German liberals dealt with his favorite subject of journalism and the curse of censorship. He described in minute detail all the techniques used in Germany for the suppression of a free press. He denounced middle-of-the-road German liberalism for its respect and obedience to a law and a public morality based solely on force and vividly contrasted, in this respect, the state of affairs in the United States with that prevailing in Germany. Law, he wrote, after the manner of Cicero, is a "moral concept," not dictation by force, and only a free people can know true law, since for them only is it a moral compulsion voluntarily imposed. He defined the true liberal as one who believes in absolute freedom of inquiry, complete tolerance, and self-determination, who subjects all things to the critique of reason, and who acts humanely, with the logic and determination that mark a man of character. And it is not without significance that Heinzen, though ready to praise the pioneer efforts of the liberals of Baden, regretted that their program did not include complete emancipation of the Jews.

Heinzen was now ready to repudiate constitutionalism, though he recognized its value as "a necessary bridge" on the road to revolution. He appealed to the republicans in exile to redouble their efforts; he planned an organization to embrace

all foreign propagandists; and he called for a republic modeled upon that of the United States.

Heinzen now took up *lèse majesté* as a profession. To the Prussian king he applied such epithets as "miserable hypocrite," "heartless despot," and "Machiavellian liar." He exposed the relations of Ludwig of Bavaria—"the fool in Munich"—with the "royal whore," Lola Montez, the Spanish dancer, "the ox who pulls the chariot of state." He branded Metternich, Czar Nicholas, and Frederick William of Prussia as the murderers of Poland, and he warned the Swiss to mark well what had happened in Cracow. He had the courage to say that Alsace-Lorraine was happy and prosperous as a part of France, because it had escaped the degradation of German tyranny. He ridiculed the shadow-boxing of the Prussian *Landtag* and suggested that these unworthy representatives of the people might spend their time to better advantage by passing laws to exterminate caterpillars and to end the immorality of flies indoors and of dogs in the streets.

Space does not permit specific reference to all the articles reproduced in the *Teutsche Revolution*, but several others deserve brief mention. "A German Problem in Arithmetic" counted the cost of the "449 princely drones" and of the bureaucrats, military and police, who deprived the German people of their freedom, and contrasted these staggering expenditures with the modest costs of government in the United States. In "Thirty Articles of War for the New Day for Officers and Privates in a Despotic State" Heinzen branded war as organized murder, though he admitted wars of liberation may have been necessary in the march of human evolution, and he looked forward to the day when war and the military system would disappear from the earth as cannibalism had disappeared earlier. He believed that standing armies and compulsory, universal military service were the greatest obstacles to the progress of reform and would no longer be needed when men were free. Military states he regarded as "murder and executioner states," and parades and

uniforms as the instruments of despotism. He described in detail the training of a soldier, the petty minutiae of drill, how the private was taught to "love his weapon" and to obey like an automaton and how he was sent back to civilian life completely crushed and a slave to authority. He publicly repented of ever having been an officer, and he exposed the brutal conduct of petty subalterns toward the common private. The army trains men to be "harlequins on the parade ground," he wrote, "police agents of the despot in peace times, and murderers in times of disorder." He appealed to the soldiers to mutiny, to violate their oath of allegiance, and to refuse to fight thereafter except for freedom and justice, and he called on all liberty-loving civilians to help him "corrupt" the army until it ceased to be the tool of the king and became the strong right arm of the people.

Thus, Heinzen had come to the conclusion that "a revolution is nothing more nor less than the self-help of a people, based on the law of nature, and directed against the stubborn, 'historic' injustices which have accumulated in the course of time." He predicted that the Hohenzollerns would eventually be buried under a German democracy; he constantly held the example of England and the United States before the eyes of his fellow-countrymen; and he insisted that the hour for action had arrived.

But he was not merely a destructive critic of the old order. He had a program ready for the new Germany. He would reduce its thirty-nine states to twelve or twenty and then federate them into a republic. He sketched the division of powers between the central government and the constituent states along generally accepted lines of federal practice. He proposed a bill of rights, with jury trial and universal suffrage; a president chosen by popular vote; a cabinet responsible to a national congress of two houses on the model of the American Senate and House of Representatives; and a supreme court, with judges appointed for life. He worked out the details of state and local government, again largely on American prece-

dents, and he provided for the recall of elected officials by court procedure. The army, of which the president would be commander-in-chief, was to consist of a small standing force, to be used solely on the border. There were to be neither forts nor barracks within the country, and the army was to consist of a popular militia modeled on the Swiss pattern. The men would keep their weapons in their homes; they would drill in civilian clothes, to avoid the pomp and circumstance of the war system; and they would learn the manual of arms in the schools along with their physical education.

In Heinzen's model state the police were to be local police only, education was to be free, and taxation limited to customs duties and a progressive income tax. All royal and princely properties would become the possession of the state. Religion, Heinzen maintained, was of no more concern to the state than the clothes men and women wore and to be supported on a entirely voluntary basis. Heinzen provided also for a free press, for poor and work relief, for a penal system based on protection and reform rather than on retribution, and without capital punishment. The heaviest penalty to be imposed would be banishment and exile. Heinzen added that political and economic reforms in the status of women were imperative and promised to discuss them fully later.

Here at last was a complete program for a German revolution. Heinzen was through with constitutional monarchy and all pleas to repair the German *Bund* or to reform the parliaments of the German states. He wanted a republic—and he advised his readers to study the history and government of the United States for further details.

CHAPTER FOUR

REVOLUTION IN PRACTICE

TWO DAYS BEFORE CHRISTMAS, 1847, HEINZEN left Havre on the steamer "Mississippi" for the United States. If he had been able to foresee what was to happen in Europe in the next few months, he would undoubtedly have remained on the Continent, since he always believed that, had he been on hand immediately at the outbreak of the German revolution, he might have exercised a decisive influence on the deliberations of the Frankfurt Parliament, for he regarded himself as "an authority on revolution." One thing is certain—he would not have co-operated with the halfhearted constitutionalists at Frankfurt who still had faith in Frederick William IV of Prussia.

Heinzen kept a diary of his trip to America, and in 1859 and 1860 published a series of articles in his *Pionier* entitled "Two Voyages to America." There were a hundred passengers aboard the "Mississippi," only ten of them women. The food was good, but the cabins too small. Heinzen spent most of his four weeks on the water in studying "English and Jesuits," for it was his luck to find six refugee Jesuits on board who had been expelled from Switzerland. The diary is interesting, detailed, and well written. It recorded frequent storms, which alarmed Heinzen far more than his experiences with the elements when he had rounded the Cape of Good Hope years ago on his return to Europe from the Dutch East Indies. It contained careful notes

on the sore throat, catarrh, and cough which the voyager developed in lieu of *mal de mer*. The ship stopped at Halifax to take on coal, enabling the passengers to eat a sumptuous meal of oysters, turkey, and crab meat at a local hotel. Heinzen was much impressed by the beauty of several English women whom he encountered in Halifax and shocked by the ugliness of the Negresses employed there as servants. Before the ship anchored in New York, he held a farewell discussion with one of the Jesuits about atheism.

The arrival of the "authority on revolution" in New York was something of an event.¹ The *Deutsche Schnellpost* of August 25, 1847, had announced Heinzen's decision to leave Europe and his plans to raise enough money in the United States to send for his family, whom he had left behind in Geneva, where the women were learning to make artificial flowers as a means of livelihood. Three days later the same paper paid a glowing tribute to Heinzen for his services to the liberal cause in Europe. Unfortunately, Eichthal, the editor who had done so much to introduce the new arrival to his American audience, died the day Heinzen left Geneva. The gallant publisher who had issued the *Schnellpost* since 1843 might have given Heinzen not only pecuniary help but much good advice and might have saved him from several mistakes which he made shortly after his arrival in the United States.

Heinzen found lodging on Frankfort Street, in New York, and proceeded at once to the office of the *Schnellpost*, where he found Dowiat, a German Catholic agitator, in charge, as editor. Though Dowiat extended a cordial welcome, Heinzen took an almost immediate dislike to the man. James Gordon Bennett noted Heinzen's arrival in the *New York Herald*, and Wilhelm Weitling, a Communist, wrote immediately from New Orleans to invite him to throw in his lot with the extreme leftists. Little wonder that Heinzen decided he must be cautious until he could

¹ See Gustav Körner, *Das deutsche Element in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord Amerika* (Cincinnati, 1880), p. 117.

become better oriented in the United States. Unfortunately, he was not cautious enough.

Dowiat presented the newly arrived publicist to several dozen New York Germans as "a great man." They drank his health in *Rheinwein*, but Heinzen refused to make any response and rather rudely excused himself to go home and rest. There followed a more formal banquet given in his honor, and on this occasion Heinzen spoke at length. He paid his respects to the enemies he had left behind in Europe, including all the philistines, obscurantists, despots, and bureaucrats of that benighted continent, and to those who had befriended him. He appealed for new friends in the United States, for a union of Germans here and in the fatherland in a great "army of the spirit," and for a committee to secure signatures for an address by German-Americans to their brethren in the fatherland. He stressed the responsibility of those who are free to those who are still in chains.² Shortly after this occasion, Heinzen left for Philadelphia, to visit Dr. Seidensticker, and the City of Brotherly Love welcomed him with a parade and a serenade by two competing German singing societies.

Meantime, Eichthal's paper was bought by a public spirited German businessman, Wilhelm Wagenitz of New York, who hoped to have Heinzen take it over. Obviously, the prospective editor had no money to invest in the venture, but Heinzen forced the retirement of Dowiat and brought in as partner and co-editor, Ivan Tyssowski, a Polish refugee, who had for a short time been dictator of Cracow and now was trying to make a living by giving fencing lessons in New York. Tyssowski invested several hundred dollars in the enterprise; Heinzen contributed his talents. He was so poor that he had to live and sleep above the printing establishment on Spruce Street.

The character of the *Deutsche Schnellpost* changed almost immediately under Heinzen's direction. His radicalism frightened away its more conservative readers, but a new clientele was

² *Deutsche Schnellpost*, January 26, 1848.

speedily recruited. Heinzen demanded revolution. He advocated the formation of radical clubs in America in order to prepare the way for a German republic, and he suggested the need for a truly radical party in the United States. When Dr. Hermann E. Ludewig opposed his plans for revolution at a banquet of the New York Deutsche Gesellschaft and remarked that what was needed was not "thunderstorms and lightning, but sunshine," Heinzen immediately broke with him and other influential German liberals and ever after sarcastically referred to Ludewig as "Dr. Sonnenschein."

To irritate his opponents was always great sport for Heinzen, and his ability to turn brilliant, cutting phrases led him into many troubles which one less facile with the pen might easily have avoided. The situation in New York in 1848 was a case in point. Heinzen apparently did not realize that by his unyielding, uncompromising attitude he was really alienating the very people from whom the support for the cause to which he was so honestly devoted must come. The hypercritical, sarcastic attitude which he manifested at the beginning of his American career marked all his later journalistic activities. He was aware of its unfortunate consequences and sometimes seemed genuinely to regret his inability to write in a less personal, offensive manner. He did not realize that some of his European techniques would hardly be understood by the German-Americans in a practical country like the United States. It was not long before the German element came to the conclusion that Heinzen was "too green" and inexperienced in American methods to lead a radical movement here. When Heinzen replied sharply that the German-Americans were selfish and cowardly and needed education in the things that really mattered, he alienated many potential friends. He rebuffed the German Socialists and Communists by his unnecessarily curt reply to Weitling's invitation to join them, and thus, during his first short visit to the United States, he succeeded in losing the support of both the more radical German leadership and the more prosperous, aristo-

cratic, and influential business element of consuls and importers and others from whom any substantial financial support for a program of radical agitation would have had to come.³

In spite of the difficulties suggested above, there was considerable interest among the German element in the United States in the events that seemed to be preparing in Europe. On the evening of March 2, 1848, for example, a huge mass meeting of Germans in New York's Columbia Hall approved a revolutionary address to the German nation and designated Heinzen as treasurer of a fund to be raised by voluntary contributions. Two days later, in a leading article in the *Schnellpost*, Heinzen appealed to the German-Americans, by contrasting the political freedom, equality, and popular sovereignty of the United States with the persecution and repression that prevailed in Germany. You cannot "petition the sun out of the heavens," he concluded, and added that no people ever became free except by the sword. Monarchy he regarded as the root of all evil, and he concluded that there could be neither freedom nor self-respect anywhere short of a republic.

On March 18 the "Cambria" docked in New York with the startling news that Louis Philippe of France was in flight and that another French revolution was in progress. Heinzen was wild with excitement and fired with new hope. He counted these days as the happiest of his life. Freiligrath had written from London: "The newspapers you will receive with this steamer will tell you everything. The bomb has exploded! Paris, Europe is in flames." He inclosed a poem, "breathlessly thrown upon the paper" between duties in the counting-house and hurried visits to Lloyds to get the latest news of events on the Continent, and he requested that the poem be published in the *Schnellpost* in order to fire its readers with the spirit of these portentous days. The poem in question was Freiligrath's well-

³ See, on this point, the excellent appraisal of Heinzen, written at the time of his death by Heinrich Rattermann of Cincinnati, in *Der Deutsche Pionier* (Cincinnati), XIII, 2-9, 98-107, 160-65, 234-44.

known call to action, which begins with the line, "Im Hochland fiel der erste Schuss." It was printed by Heinzen in New York before it was published in Europe, and the original, in Freiligrath's vigorous hand, was preserved among Heinzen's papers. It was read, within the next few weeks, at numerous German-American mass meetings organized in New York to celebrate the Revolution of 1848.

Heinzen planned to return to Europe immediately, though his liquid assets at the time hardly exceeded ten dollars. On March 21 he appealed in his paper to his fellow-countrymen for funds to enable him to take personal charge of the German revolution. He suggested that the money might be sent to London, in care of Freiligrath. He announced that Tyssowski would edit the *Schnellpost* during his absence and that he would send frequent reports from the European scene of action.

The response of many of the German and other immigrant groups in New York was encouraging. Meetings were held, toasts were drunk, and speeches were made in many languages to hail the dawning of the new day of freedom and liberty. In New York City a joint mass meeting of all European nationalities expressed sympathy for the French Revolution. The Irish met in Shakespeare Hall, the Germans in St. John's, and declared for a free Europe and a brotherhood of nations. The Poles joined the French in their celebrations. At one of these assemblies a Frenchman spoke, Heinzen responded for the Germans, Tyssowski for the Poles, and O'Conner for the Irish. In Philadelphia a mass meeting packed the hall and overflowed into the streets. Baltimore experienced similar enthusiasm, but the Middle West was slower to catch fire.

In New York, Philadelphia, and several smaller cities Heinzen was instructed to carry the greetings of the various gatherings to the Parisians, and funds were collected to enable him to return to Europe. In April the Cincinnati Germans held a monster rally in the courthouse yard and resolved to create finance committees in every ward, to give benefit concerts and theater

performances, and to raise collections in the churches for the revolution. The women at once began to make a red-white-gold flag, to be presented to the soldiers of the German revolution. In spite of this enthusiastic beginning, the treasurer of the Cincinnati fund had to explain, when he sent the first money order to Heinzen, with instructions to use it as he pleased, that the Cincinnati *Volksblatt* and the *Hochwächter* had opposed the drive for funds and that some of the preachers thought it better to give money to the poor than to send it abroad for radical revolutions. The resolutions adopted several months later, in Belleville, Illinois, must suffice as a final illustration of the response of the German element in the United States to the exciting news from across the Atlantic. "Thousands of miles separate us from Germany," they began. "Years have passed since we bade our native soil the last fond adieu, but neither distance nor time have weakened the love we bear to the land of our youth. . . . We do know German affairs, for they have driven us hitherwards. We know what is possible, for we see accomplished here what we wish for you. We are no better than you are, but our laws and institutions are better than yours. . . . Only through liberty comes union such as Germany needs." The resolutions closed with a call to action against the "inhuman cruelties of a drunken soldiery" and "a drunken King at Berlin" and with an appeal to be satisfied with nothing short of a republic, for "a republican constitution [is] well adapted . . . to the quiet and reflective character of the German nation."⁴

On March 25, 1848, Heinzen started back to Europe, on the return voyage of the "Cambria," bound for Liverpool. He had \$400 in his pocket, of which nearly half was borrowed money to be paid off by advertising in the *Schnellpost*. To use his own words, "a few hundred more" were sent to him in Europe "for the cause." The matter is important, for later he was falsely accused of misappropriating huge sums to his own private uses

⁴ See *Memoirs of Gustave Koerner, 1809-1896*, ed. Thomas I. McCormack (Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1909), I, 533-40.

and for luxurious living. A number of Germans came to the dock in New York to see Heinzen off. From Halifax he sent back an article for the *Schnellpost*, stating his conclusion that the worst obstacles to a successful German revolution would not be the princes or the army but the advocates of constitutional monarchy.

The ambassador of revolution reached London by the middle of April. He spent several days with Freiligrath and other excited refugees and then proceeded to Paris. Here he cooled his heels for two days, waiting for an audience, which never came, with the poet Lamartine, who had turned to statecraft. Leaving a letter behind, expressing his hope for French and German co-operation and for mutual disarmament when both nations should be republics, he went on to Geneva to see his family. After two days with them, he proceeded to Baden to join the uprising led by Friedrich Hecker.

The events of the ill-fated German uprisings of 1848 and 1849 need not be chronicled in detail. They are a well-known part of the story of nineteenth-century European liberalism, and a number of excellent accounts are available. In addition, some of the participants with whom the subject of this biography was closely associated have published their memoirs.⁵

The revolution began with great enthusiasm with the Hecker

⁵ The best account is Veit Valentin's *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution von 1848-49* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1930). Also useful are Charles W. Dahlinger, *The German Revolution of 1849* (New York, 1903); Ferdinand Schreyer, *Geschichte der Revolution in Baden, 1848-49* (Darmstadt, 1909); Otto Wiltberger, *Die deutschen politischen Flüchtlinge in Strassburg von 1830-1849* (Berlin, 1910); and Paul Neitzke, *Die deutschen politischen Flüchtlinge in der Schweiz, 1848-49* (Charlottenburg, 1926). Among memoirs and contemporary accounts may be mentioned: Gustav Struve, *Geschichte der drei Volkserhebung in Baden* (Bern, 1849); Friedrich Hecker, *Die Erhebung des Volkes in Baden für die deutsche Republik im Frühjahr 1848* (Basel, 1848); Wilhelm Marr, *Das junge Deutschland in der Schweiz* (Leipzig, 1846); Johann Philip Becker and Christian Essellen, *Geschichte der süddeutschen Mai-Revolution des Jahres 1849* (Geneva, 1849); Corvin, *Aus dem Leben eines Volkskämpfers-Erinnerungen* (Amsterdam, 1861); and General Franz Sigel's *Denkwürdigkeiten aus den Jahren 1848-49* (Mannheim, 1902); cf. also "Mathilde Franziska Giesler-Anneke: Memoiren einer Frau aus dem Badisch-Pfalzischen Feldzug," in *German-American Annals* (N.S.), XVI, 82-140.

Putsch in Baden in 1848, died down quickly, only to break out again in 1849. From the first, it suffered from a division of counsel and strategy, between moderates like Brentano, who advocated constitutional monarchy, and radicals like Heinzen and Gustav Struve, who wished to go much further to the left, but not far enough to enlist the Communist minority, who refused to co-operate unless it were assured of the immediate establishment of proletarian rule. There were many shades of difference between these extremes. The uprising had many of the earmarks of a romantic movement which did not lack in spirit and ideals but which had few practical weapons with which to oppose a ruthless and solidly intrenched reaction. It was nurtured in all sorts of liberal and revolutionary clubs, among workers, students, and members of the *Turnvereine* and the *Burschenschaften* of the universities, and for a brief moment there were signs that the disaffection with the old regime might even spread through the armed forces, and there were some mutinies. There was an inordinate amount of public demonstration, much parading, singing and drinking of toasts, giving the movement in some areas the characteristics of an outing or a Sunday picnic instead of a serious revolution. Bombastic proclamations were issued by the scores, but they could not be implemented by action. Students, with youthful idealism, rallied to the defense of "the rights of man," and the wives of patriot leaders, like Struve, Ludwig Blenker, and Fritz Anneke, who commanded the artillery, rode into battle with their husbands, like modern Amazons, dressed in male attire and mounted on spirited chargers.

Friedrich Hecker, lawyer of Mannheim, a member of the legislature of Baden, and an incurable romantic who never lost the fire of his student days, became the hero of the uprising of 1848 and retained his popularity with the masses though he fled to Switzerland and later abandoned Europe for a farm in the United States. Hecker was not a radical, in Heinzen's or Struve's sense, and he broke with them on that account; but

workers, soldiers, and Turner continued to sing the "Hecker song" in every tavern to the tune of "Schleswig-Holstein meerschlungen," and the Hecker cult mounted to fantastic extremes. New poems continued to appear to celebrate Hecker's fame and devotion to liberty. They began with lines like the following,

Hecker hoch! Dein Name schalle
An dem ganzen deutschen Rhein,

or, as in 1849, called for Hecker's return from America,

Hecker komm! Die Völker rufen!
Komm aus fernem Freiheitsland.⁶

Ardent liberals wore "Hecker hats" at hastily constructed barricades. The picture of their hero adorned their homes, and Hecker received loving cups and other marks of popular favor throughout the South German lands. There was something convivial and easygoing and "*gemüthlich*" about these South Germans even when they took up the bloody business of revolution, and for a time there prevailed what Valentin called "a comfortable, pleasant anarchy." Hecker was the popular leader of the revolt, in so far as one may speak of a leader, but it was obvious from the outset that no one had a practical plan to cope successfully with the bullets and bayonets of the reaction, spearheaded by a ruthless, hypocritical Prussia.

Scores of other leaders might be mentioned. The list would include men like Gustav Struve, editor and lawyer, idealist, romanticist, republican, eager and honest and impractical, with a mania for opposition and no talent for organization, a close friend of Karl Blind, the Socialist, and a great admirer of Robespierre. Perhaps Struve's greatest service was his nomination of Johann Philip Becker as commander-in-chief of the popular army in 1849. Lorenz Brentano, thirty-six years old, had been a member of the left at the Frankfurt Parliament, but he was much less of a radical than some of his earlier acts had led people to believe.

⁶ Christian Petzet, *Die Blütezeit der deutschen politischen Lyrik von 1840 bis 1850* (Munich, 1903).

When charged with direction of the provisional revolutionary government, he kept monarchists in office and rejected all republicans, a category in which he included not only Heinzen but many less outspoken opponents of the policy of taking the middle road of constitutional monarchy. Then there was Amand Gögg, an excellent agitator in the *Volksvereine* of Baden and among the soldiers, *Turnvereine*, and *Arbeitervereine*. Joseph Fickler, publisher of the *Seeblätter* at Constance, was a republican who had begun his political transformation by opposing German Catholicism to Roman Catholicism. Finally, one must mention General Louis Mieroslawski, a trained soldier of thirty-four years of age, whom the revolutionists imported to lead their motley army to victory. Mieroslawski was a Polish patriot who had won his spurs as a lad in the Polish uprising in 1831, had been wounded in Sicily, and had now come from Paris to help his German fellow-republicans. The tall, blue-eyed, curly-haired Pole, in his blue coat, red trousers, and gold lacc, was a shining example of personal courage and martial glory, but he could not speak German and had to address his troops in French or through Franz Sigel, who served as his adjutant general.

Thus, in 1848-49, there was excitement and confusion throughout South Germany, shooting in Berlin and Vienna, and shouting and parading and singing almost everywhere in the German lands. Unfortunately, much of the revolutionary spirit was spent in impractical, misguided romanticism, though the leaders and many of the rank and file had a noble vision of a united, democratic Germany in a free Europe. Had they succeeded, the whole course of European and world history would have been greatly changed. The revolutionary levies lacked arms and equipment; many turned out armed only with clubs, scythes, threshing flails, and antiquated shooting irons. There was little discipline because officers were elected, after the democratic fashion, by their own men. The service of supply was not only poor but almost nonexistent, and desertions were

numerous after the first moment of excitement had passed and the first bullets began to fly. The revolution was crushed under the sinister leadership of Prussia and with the co-operation of most of the crowned heads in Germany and Austria.

For years after 1849 the chief participants in the revolutionary fiasco continued to quarrel among themselves in their efforts to throw the blame for failure on others or to defend their own claims to fame. The controversy, begun in Europe, was continued in the United States, for hundreds of "Forty-eighters" came to this country, at first, to wait "bis es drüben wieder los geht" and then to settle down to become good American citizens and to make inestimable cultural contributions to the emerging pattern of American civilization. Among them were Hecker, Sigel, Blenker, Carl Schurz, August Willich, Alexander Schimmelpfennig, and Peter Osterhaus, to mention only some of those who a dozen years after the ill-fated events of 1848 and 1849 took up arms again as officers in the American Civil War. Heinzen came, too, to fight with the pen rather than the sword. He was so embittered by his European experiences that they deeply affected the rest of his career. Though disillusioned, he did not abandon hope for another revolution; but he never ceased his violent, personal controversies with those fellow-revolutionists whom he blamed for the blundering, weak-kneed, halfhearted, compromising tactics of 1848 and 1849.

When Heinzen returned to Europe, he hoped to find a seat in the Frankfurt Parliament, which began its preliminary session on March 30, 1848. He actually got some twelve thousand votes in Hamburg, where he ran as an unsuccessful candidate. What his program of action would have been is clear from a letter Heinzen addressed to the "Hamburg radicals." In this statement, prepared in Geneva, and printed in the *Mannheimer Zeitung*, the unsuccessful candidate expressed his appreciation for the support he had received from the voters of Hamburg and outlined a program for a federal German republic which he had hoped to sponsor as a representative from Hamburg or some

other constituency. He opposed centralization and advocated a large measure of states' rights. He argued for revolution as the only means to achieve these ends, but he believed terror and bloodshed could be avoided unless the reaction forced such methods on the people. The new republic, he argued, must provide not only political liberty and equality but also a more just regulation of economic conditions, provided always that the program of social reform stopped short of communism. "I do not wish to destroy individual property rights," he wrote; "I only wish to see that they are safeguarded for all." He wanted the state to guarantee all men the opportunity to work, for ability to earn the means of existence he considered the first human right. Heinzen wished to protect labor against exploitation by capital, and he advocated an income tax as a device for social reform. With special reference to the local interests of Hamburg, he championed free trade and stated his belief that, the moment Europe was free and monarchy and aristocracy were abolished, trade barriers would disappear. Heinzen's letter closed with a statement favoring the recall of representatives but expressing much the same views about the obligation of a delegate to use his own independent judgment on issues arising while he is in office which John Stuart Mill expressed in his well-known discussion of the relation between a popularly elected representative and his constituency.

Heinzen forever after felt that his absence from the great German deliberative body at Frankfurt was a decisive factor in its failure. Even before he set foot on German soil, he sent articles to the newspapers attacking the compromisers and theoreticians who were about to betray the real needs of the German people. With several dozen workers from Geneva, Heinzen proceeded to Baden to join the Hecker revolt which followed the collapse of the Frankfurt debates. The *Putsch* of the Hecker men was short lived indeed. As far as Heinzen was concerned, its most tangible and important result was a violent quarrel and a break with Hecker which proved to be final.

Heinzen had met the popular hero only once before, at Heidelberg, and he recorded in his memoirs that his first impressions were unfavorable. It is to be remembered that Hecker refrained from writing his own version of their encounter at Hünningen, near Basel, where Heinzen found Hecker living in an inn, attended by many aides and dictating long dispatches. In a long walk which the two men took through the countryside, Hecker explained that he had appealed to the leaders of revolution in the other German states for a simultaneous uprising with Baden and that their failure to respond had left him isolated and had forced his retreat toward Switzerland. He insisted that he was planning another attack on Baden, after a reorganization of his forces, and wanted to use the "Schusterinsel," across from Hünningen and on Baden territory, for that purpose.

Heinzen agreed to take over the problem of organization of the revolutionary force, only to be thwarted, according to his own account, by incompetent commanders on the Schusterinsel. Ever ready to organize revolutionary clubs to overthrow more moderate leadership, Heinzen now decided to publish a story in the *Baseler National-Zeitung*, to explain that the island would be difficult to attack without firing across the French and Swiss boundaries and that therefore international complications, which Heinzen was eager to precipitate, might result. Hecker stopped publication of the article because he regarded it as treasonable. Heinzen admitted that his friend Karl Blind had given the article a twist to suggest that the Germans were appealing for foreign intervention, a proposal which Hecker had consistently opposed. The latter had rejected Herwegh's offer to bring a foreign legion of German workmen from Paris to help the revolutionists and a similar proposal to bring in Swiss aid, and he always insisted that the revolution must remain a strictly German affair. A heated altercation between Hecker and Heinzen followed, in which both lost their tempers. Heinzen believed that he was being excluded from his rightful role in the revolution because he was not a native of Baden. Hecker, according to Heinzen's

account, claimed that he was the originator of the revolt and therefore must assume all responsibility for it. Hecker also made some unfavorable observations about Heinzen's abilities as a journalist, and the quarrel became so violent that a restoration of friendly relations became impossible. Heinzen resolved to publish the article which had been the cause of the dispute.

The incident reflects unfavorably upon both men and was the beginning of a lifelong enmity. All Struve's efforts to bring about a reconciliation proved fruitless. It may be said in defense of both men that they were under a terrific strain at the time. Each regarded himself as the archapostle of revolution and as the sole expert on revolutionary procedures. They disagreed fundamentally as to the ends which the revolution was designed to accomplish and on the desirability of intervention from outside Germany. Heinzen—"bloody Heinzen"—was far more radical than Hecker and conceived of revolution as a cosmic, or at least an international, movement, whereas Hecker was something of a Baden "particularist." As a matter of fact, the plans for the Schusterinsel collapsed anyway. The French government protested the border disturbances, and Heinzen evacuated the little island which proved so fateful to his career and led his tiny force into French territory. Hecker went on to Switzerland, Heinzen and Struve to Strassburg, to issue new leaflets and brochures for the revolutionizing of Germany and Europe.

In Strassburg a revolutionary committee was created consisting of Heinzen, Struve, Becker, Blind, and a number of other radicals. Hecker objected strenuously to any appeal for French or other aid from outside Germany. The only response from the French authorities, as a matter of fact, was to order the revolutionary group to dissolve. It was at this exciting moment in Heinzen's stormy career that stories were circulated to the effect that he had spent as much as ten or twelve thousand dollars of other people's money, received mostly from America, on his own sumptuous living instead of for revolutionary purposes, as had been intended. Similar tales were circulated about

Struve. Heinzen was furious. He categorically denied the insinuations and insisted that he had never had more than four thousand dollars in contributions from both the United States and Germany and that he had spent that amount in helping fellow-refugees and in meeting the minimum needs of himself and his family. He blamed the Communists and the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* for spreading the tale in Germany and the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* for circulating it in the United States⁷ and Hecker and his friends for giving it credence. A violent newspaper war broke out over the incident in the Strassburg press, to be continued for many years after in the German-American press. Although Struve and fifty others signed a document in Strassburg completely exonerating Heinzen, the charge was never completely dropped.

When Lamartine, acting for the French government, ordered the radical revolutionary committee at Strassburg to dissolve and move into the interior of France, Heinzen remained behind, fully convinced that the revolution must be started in Prussia and determined to continue his propaganda activities to that end. With Struve, he issued an appeal to all German republicans (*Die Schilderhebung der deutschen Republikaner im April 1848*). The brochure was sold for fifty centimes, and the proceeds were intended for the treasury of the revolutionary committee. *A Plan for Revolutionizing and Republicanizing Germany* was issued under the same joint authorship at Birsfelden, near Basel. It advocated ways and means to carry the revolutionary propaganda to the army, to arm the people, and to redistribute landholdings and revise the tax system. Still another brochure favored close co-operation between France and Germany. In these, as in several other publications, one finds the main principles of Heinzen's revolutionary plan. They all emphasized the belief that the time for the use of legal methods had passed, that a temporary republican dictatorship might be needed in order to cope with the forces of reaction, and that the champions of

⁷ See *Janus*, November 24, 1852.

liberty in all countries must unite for the liberation of mankind from the tyranny of the princes.

Heinzen and Struve went on to Switzerland, where the latter started one of the editions of his *Deutsche Zuschauer*, and Heinzen moved on, from Basel to Bern to Geneva, as he had done once before, under the watchful eye of the Swiss police. Mazzini approached Heinzen with a plan to raise a German-Italian legion for service in Sicily, and the latter actually started for Rome, only to turn back at Marseille when he encountered fugitives returning from the unsuccessful revolt in Genoa. The Swiss, of course, forbade all attempts to raise military forces on their soil for use in neighboring countries with which Switzerland was officially at peace, and again Heinzen was urged to move on. When the Swiss Federal Council ordered him to leave the country altogether, Heinzen exploded in the *Berner Zeitung*, edited by his friend Jenni, and issued an appeal to the Swiss people over the heads of their government, whose cowardice and inhumanity Heinzen denounced in his customary journalistic style. By April, 1849, he was on his way to Brussels, traveling on a French pass and apparently with the foolhardy notion of going on to Berlin. On second thought about what the reaction of the Prussian police might be to his presence, Heinzen changed his mind, went on to Paris, then boldly reversed his route to return to Geneva. Here he again became a source of controversy between local and federal authorities and finally agreed to leave. At this juncture the news came that a second revolution had started in the Palatinate of Baden, that the troops were in a state of mutiny, and that a provisional government was already functioning in Karlsruhe. With new hope, and on borrowed money, Heinzen re-entered Germany for a second attempt at revolution.

Unfortunately, 1849 did not turn out any better than the Hecker *Putsch* of the preceding spring. Heinzen concluded that the Hecker group was determined to rob him of his rightful place of leadership; that Brentano, the leader of the provisional

government, was a traitor to republicanism (as a matter of fact he had never professed it); that in any case no one save a native of Baden was welcome; and that reactionaries were in the saddle and opposed his plans for a Swiss-German legion. Heinzen took lodgings at a small, worker's house in Karlsruhe, and here he nursed his wrath and became increasingly embittered by frustration. He was bursting with ideas and keen to see and criticize the errors of others, but he was helpless to assume command of events.

At Karlsruhe, Heinzen talked with Brentano for the first time when he asked him for a pass on the state railroads. Thence, he proceeded to Mannheim and Heidelberg, and back to Karlsruhe again. While waiting impatiently for other duties, he published his *What To Do*, with the financial help of Johann Philip Becker. It restated his arguments against constitutional monarchy and made a plea to the people of Baden to shed their particularism and make the revolution a Pan-German affair. It called for a complete break with the forces of the Frankfurt Parliament, "the fools of reaction," and denounced that body for offering the crown of a limited German monarchy to the king of Prussia, who not only rejected the offer but recalled the Prussian delegates. The pamphlet warned its readers against the machinations of Russia and Austria, the supporters of Prussian absolutism, and demanded a revolution that would free all Europe, make common cause with the forces of freedom in Hungary, Italy, France, and Switzerland, and end in the streets of Berlin and St. Petersburg.

Together with Struve, Becker, Amand Gögg, and others, Heinzen had organized the Club for Radical Progress (*Klub des entschiedenen Fortschritts*), to propagandize for republicanism in the army and among the workers and students, in order to checkmate constitutionalists like Brentano. The radicals urged the arrest of all traitors and spies, the confiscation of the estates of the nobility, the removal of all reactionaries from public office, the union of Baden and the Palatinate, and the creation

of a revolutionary police force. It was also suggested that the "famous Mieroslawski" be summoned from Paris to lead the revolution. Frightened by such radical demands, and by the use of terminology reminiscent of the bloody terror of the French Revolution, the provisional government had Struve arrested on the charge that he and his group were plotting against the constituent assembly of Baden.

On March 9, 1849, Heinzen published "A Republican War and Revolutionary Plan," in a paper known as *Die Evolution*. He advocated an alliance between France and the German republicans and the formation of a German legion composed of refugee workers and other volunteers in France and Switzerland who were willing to start the march on Germany. Heinzen felt sure that the French would follow such an invasion by military intervention, that a German revolutionary committee would clean up the debris of reaction immediately by strong measures, and that a war between France and the reactionary German governments would follow, thus making international law "the executor of the revolution." In the end, Heinzen expected France and a revolutionized Germany to sign a defensive and offensive alliance, Switzerland to join the new coalition, and, after the return of peace, the creation of a congress of nations to establish a completely new international order. He thought France and Germany eventually would attack Russia, restore ravaged Poland, and make all Europe safe for democracy. Heinzen closed with a noble appeal to eradicate the curse of nationalism and the idea of neutrality in any struggle that involved human liberty. "At a time when liberty is being murdered in Europe and the Continent converted into a cemetery, the guilt must rest upon Switzerland and France, who, as a result of their neutrality, not only calmly tolerate despotism, but help to disarm its enemies."

On March 30, 1849, Heinzen submitted a military plan to Becker, the commander-in-chief of the revolutionary armies, and to Franz Sigel, the minister of war. Essentially it embodied

the same scheme for a German-Swiss legion, an élite corps composed of tried and true republicans. It also included a plan to undermine Switzerland's neutrality, to secure German and Swiss co-operation, to set up headquarters at Lörrach, on the border, in order to attract additional recruits, and to carry on so violent an agitation with the aid of Swiss radicals that Switzerland either would have to tolerate the movement or face revolution herself. Heinzen always contended that the pen and not the sword was his special weapon and that he had no expert knowledge in military affairs. This did not deter him, however, from working out detailed plans for a force of twelve hundred men, half German and half Swiss, to consist of four companies of infantry, one of sharpshooters, a squadron of light cavalry, and a battery of artillery. He offered personally to supervise the organization, and to command it, unless it became so large as to require the appointment of a professional military man. Heinzen reserved the right to appoint all officers, he himself to be a major, and believed that 50,000 gulden would be sufficient to launch the venture. Horses, guns, and other equipment were to be obtained "from the state."

Needless to add, Brentano would have nothing to do with such dangerous proposals. He also vetoed Heinzen's plans for an immediate assault on the strategic bastion of Landau and for an invasion of Prussia through the Palatinate. Heinzen's reception in the Palatinate was cold indeed, probably because the provisional government suspected him of designs to set up a radical dictatorship. Heinzen fretted over his inaction. He went on an unimportant mission to Kassel, then to Heidelberg, where he succeeded in persuading General Mieroslawski to march on Landau, only to discover, when he reached Kaiserslautern, that fugitives were streaming in from the fortress which the Prussians had already occupied. Once again, Heinzen returned to Karlsruhe, where he was offered a job in the "literary bureau" of the revolution and was commissioned to write propaganda for the democratic papers. When the Brentano government

censored some of his contributions, he resigned. On June 2, 1849, he published, in the *Karlsruher Zeitung*, his "A Sermon to Soldiers," which was an appeal to his "old comrades" to choose between despotism and freedom, between European republicanism and European cossackism. Referring to the king of Prussia in ultraviolent language and including other monarchs in these denunciations, such as the king of Saxony and the "tyrant of St. Petersburg," the article closed with the words: "Remember Cologne and Berlin, Frankfurt and Dresden. Your uniforms drip with the blood of your brothers." In short, make up your minds—either fight the people or accept the outstretched hands of fellowship!

One more product of Heinzen's revolutionary pen needs to be examined here, for it was far more significant as a revelation of his political thinking than anything that had appeared earlier. It is the articles on "Murder" ("Der Mord"), which appeared in January and February, 1849, in *Die Evolution*, published in Biel and edited by Becker. In these articles Heinzen first announced his complete acceptance of tyrannicide as "the chief means of historical progress." Tyrannicide, said Heinzen, was no invention of his. It had been advocated and used in earlier times as an agency of social revolution. But Heinzen now restated the argument in his own vigorous words and made the doctrine his very own. He described the various types of murder: capital punishment, genuine murder, and war. Each had but one objective—to get one's opponent out of the world. On pure grounds of humanity and justice, Heinzen continued, no one had a right to take another's life. But in the realm of statecraft he was willing to make an exception. At any rate, here the situation was far more complicated. Because the opponents of revolutionary progress have the army at their command, occasions might arise, as in the time of Robespierre, when it became necessary to kill hundreds and thousands in the interest of humanity. Thus, unfortunately, murder remained a historical necessity. Heinzen recalled what he had learned at the Gymnasium from

his "royal" teachers about the justifiable murder of ancient tyrants. Aristogeiton and Harmodios were not "anarchists" or "bloody murderers" because they had rid the people of the tyrant Hipparchos, nor had his teachers taught him that the latter had been "a rightful sovereign" or "a sacred personage." Heinzen reviewed the list of tyrannicides and concluded that the pagan world always regarded the extermination of tyrants as a duty, an honor, and an act of justice.

The deduction was easily made from history that the justification of murder must hinge on the motive for the deed. Heinzen discovered that little murderers usually hang, that the big ones escape, and that the party of freedom has martyrs, the party of reaction only tools. War he described as organized, mass murder, but also as a tool, or a knife, to cut out a cancer from the body politic or to accomplish a specific political purpose. Heinzen did not indulge in pious talk about morality and justice in connection with wars. He simply maintained that opponents of liberty, like Metternich, the Russian czar, the Prussian king, and all their generals, had taught the people that "murder is the main method of historical evolution." He described, in ghastly language, the barbarism of war and all the destruction that had been wrought among men simply to save a few tottering thrones. Why not use the blood of kings and aristocrats in the interest of social progress? Why shed only the blood of democrats, he queried. So Heinzen suggested the need for new inventions—explosives, underground chambers, bombs planted under pavements, containers filled with poison—devices that might rain destruction on whole regiments of the supporters of tyranny. He denied the possibility of acting according to one's conscience in dealing with reactionary murderers and sought the most effective means to get them out of the way. So he ended his first signed article on the subject with these words: "If you have to blow up half a continent and pour out a sea of blood in order to destroy the party of the barbarians, have no scruples of conscience. He is no true republican who would not gladly pay

with his life for the satisfaction of exterminating a million barbarians." In his second contribution on the subject of tyrannicide, he added: "They will be the greatest benefactors of mankind who will make it possible for a few to get thousands out of the way."

Heinzen was concerned not only with tyrannicide as a theory but specifically with the inventions that would make it practicable and successful. Ever after, he was referred to in some quarters as Heinzen "the bloody," but he clung to his convictions throughout the remainder of his life. Having lost his faith in the mere moral force of freedom as an instrument of progress, he now wanted to produce more practical methods of insuring victory over those who controlled the munitions plants. Heinzen had great faith in the possibilities of chemistry and physics and seriously considered various methods for poisoning food or producing explosive capsules. Indeed, he advocated prizes to encourage scientific research in these fields. He saw the problem in simple terms—kings and princes were the greatest obstacles to progress, so have them removed by the quickest and most practical methods!⁸

It is pointless to follow Heinzen's movements in detail during the revolutionary year of 1849. They centered, for the most part, around Karlsruhe, Heidelberg, the Rhine country, and Strassburg. Everywhere he met with disappointment. His last disheartening experience was the discovery that all the rumors about revolt in Alsace and Lorraine, about an impending Franco-German war, and about French and Swiss republicans on the

⁸ It is interesting to point out that when Johann Most, German anarchist publisher, was tried after the assassination of President McKinley one of the charges against him was the publication, in his *Freiheit*, of an article advocating the murder of rulers. He had reprinted Heinzen's "Der Mord." Most's attorney, Morris Hillquit, pointed out that Heinzen had been dead for twenty years; that his article had been directed against the crowned heads of Europe a half-century ago and had been reprinted many times; and that only one copy of Most's paper had been sold—and that to the policeman who made the arrest. The court, however, sentenced Most to one year on Blackwell's Island (see Morris Hillquit, *Loose Leaves from a Busy Life* [New York, 1934], chap. viii; see also Rudolf Rocker, *Johann Most: Das Leben eines Rebellen* [Berlin, 1924], pp. 401, 403, 413).

march to help their German brothers-in-arms were utterly without foundation. Finally, he went on to Lake Constance, where he had advised Sigel to concentrate his forces. He found everything in a state of chaos and the region wholly unprepared to continue the struggle. Completely disillusioned by what he called his contacts with "the bigheaded weaklings and the jealous traitors," convinced at last of the hopelessness of his cause, his services and advice rejected by the revolutionists, and even his efforts as a publicist censored and thwarted by men whom he considered too weak for decisive action, there was little left for Heinzen to do except shoulder a musket as a private. He concluded that he could be more useful in other ways. So he returned to Switzerland, determined to eschew propaganda forever and to write novels and poetry and plays instead. Ever after he was twitted by his foes and journalistic rivals for never having smelled powder or having stood in the rain of bullets (*Kugelregen*).

Practically penniless, Heinzen and his family took up their residence in the attic of Galeer's house in Geneva. Here they lived on forty francs a month. When Struve also turned up in Geneva, he and Heinzen and Galeer and Mazzini promptly launched *Der Völkerbund*, only to see it expire after the first issue. Thereupon, Heinzen published a pamphlet of some fifty pages in Bern in 1849 in which he reviewed once more the mistakes of the revolution. In the main it was a restatement of his attacks on the "legalists" and the "particularists" of Baden. He deplored the failure to use "terror" and commended Kosuth for having avoided that mistake in Hungary. He denounced the failure to confiscate the estates of the nobility for the revolution and pointed out mistakes in military policy and propaganda techniques. Heinzen was deeply depressed by his own failure to play a bigger role but attributed the responsibility largely to political cliques, "beer philistines," and Hecker favorites. Ever after he clung to his diagnosis of the failures of 1848 and 1849 in his American journals and repeated his at-

tacks on the Frankfurt Parliament, Hecker, Brentano, and many others whom he first encountered in these stirring years.⁹

Professor Valentin, recognized authority on the German revolutions of 1848 and 1849, has described Heinzen as "the most determined and active German republican of the forties," and most of Heinzen's contemporaries testified to his complete sincerity and honesty and admitted his extraordinary talent for propaganda. A French prefect of the Lower Rhine once wrote to his chief in Paris that Heinzen wrote "avec une impudence rare et une logique inflexible. Dans les plus mauvais jours de la Terreur on n'a point osé afficher les principes subversifs de tout ordre social avec un cynisme aussi audacieux."¹⁰ The same people found him impractical, and some considered him vain, conceited, and completely unco-operative. A few challenged his personal bravery and charged that he had taken to his heels as soon as the first Prussian bullets began to fly. Others believed him to be a potential dictator, "bloody" and brutal, and some thought he had a martyr complex and was jealous of all possible rivals, a mere creator of confusion because of his fanatical and extreme demands.

Heinzen offered rejoinders to all these criticisms of his role in the revolution, but none roused him to such a fury of rage as the charge of having misappropriated revolutionary funds to his private use. This libel, which had originated in Strassburg, hounded him throughout his long journalistic career in the United States. Heinzen traced it to a friend (Krätzer) of Hecker's commissioner of war (Doll), whose loyalty Heinzen

⁹ See his lecture "Die Revolution," in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (Boston, 1871), II, 60-82. On May 10, 1857, Heinzen published the following description of the Frankfurt Parliament in the *Pionier*:

"Hundert fünfzig Burcaukraten—
Viele Worte, keine Thaten!
Hundert fünfzig Aristokraten—
Vaterland, du bist verrathen!
Hundert fünfzig Professoren—
Vaterland, du bist verloren!"

¹⁰ Quoted in Neitzke, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-46.

had questioned in a letter to his chief. Doll had threatened to reply to Heinzen's accusation with bullets, but, as a matter of fact, he committed suicide on Hecker's farm in America some years later. The *Rheinische Zeitung* repeated the embezzlement charge against Heinzen, and the *Kölner Zeitung* published a statement, allegedly originating in Philadelphia, to the effect that Heinzen had 25,000 francs from the Germans of North America when he left New York. The *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* put the figure at \$6,000. Heinzen insisted \$400 was the exact amount he had in his pockets when he set sail for Europe. He admitted that additional small amounts were forwarded to him but insisted that they had all been legitimately used and that he had a right to draw on the fund for his own subsistence and that of his family. There is no evidence to show that the Heinzens ever enjoyed anything beyond the most minimum standards of comfort, either in Europe or in the United States, and there were years when they lived very close to the starvation level. When Heinzen left Geneva for the last time, he took only his wife and child with him. His wife's two sisters and a brother had been parceled out to relatives because he was no longer able to support them.

Heinzen left Switzerland on September 15, 1849. The government, by this time, was so eager to be rid of him at any cost, and without publicity and scandal, that it complied with his demands for money to finance his departure and for a safe-conduct through France and promised that he would not be turned over to the Germans by the French authorities. The Swiss Federal Council regarded Struve and Heinzen as menaces to the domestic and external relations of Switzerland. So Heinzen received his passports and 1,200 francs. His trunks were not opened at the French border, but his manuscripts, which he had intrusted to Mazzini to forward to London, fell into the hands of the Germans. When Heinzen reached Havre with his wife and son, the Swiss consul was ready to pay his passage to the United States, but Heinzen refused the offer and went instead

to England, apparently because he still believed revolution was imminent and therefore wished to be near the scene of action.

Heinzen was forty when he arrived in London with his little family, to be near "the revolutionary terrain." He knew no English and found London "a terrible, heartless city." The year he spent there he described as worse than any of the five preceding years of exile. He arrived with empty pockets, as usual, but with a head still bursting with ideas for a revolution. Promptly he published *Lessons of the Revolution* and predicted that the next uprising might cost several million heads. In another manuscript he suggested that the next upheaval would overthrow all the monarchs of Europe and would emanate from Paris. "In a few years the present map of Europe may be useless." He believed the outcome of the final struggle for freedom would be a new law of nations which would guarantee to all peoples the right of self-determination. He wrote in praise of Ledru-Rollin and Mazzini and Kossuth; and he cited Hecker as a prize example of what "too many great men" and too much German individualism had done to wreck the popular cause in Germany. Discussing German education, with its emphasis on theory, he held it responsible for the German failure to co-operate and work in unity, though he admitted that there were advantages in teaching people to subject everything to a critical analysis. Heinzen's sarcastic sallies at the expense of discredited German revolutionists were frequently unfair, but his appeal for clearheaded, purposeful, realistic planning was justified, and his emphasis on social reform as the accompaniment of political change showed a clear understanding of what was to come. In England, and later in the United States, Heinzen clung to revolution as the most passionate love of his life, and he never entirely despaired of living long enough to see the new day of world republicanism dawn.

Needless to say, such productions as *Die Lehren der Revolution* stirred the London press to hostility, and the *Times* demanded the expulsion of its author. When nothing happened,

Heinzen concluded that Englishmen really knew what freedom of the press involved. So the Heinzens continued to live in a room near Leicester Square. The great number of beggars in the streets and the indescribable squalor of the poor sections of the city depressed them greatly. Through letters of introduction from Mazzini, Heinzen received a number of social invitations, and through these contacts he earned a little money from tutoring. He spent pleasant evenings at the home of Stansfield, radical member of Parliament, and with refugees from many lands, including Mazzini and Louis Blanc, his old friend Ruge, and Klapka, the Hungarian. There was much good talk and also many a game of chess.

A few days after Heinzen's arrival, Struve came, with his wife, his brother-in-law, and a secretary, and rented rooms above the Heinzens. For a time the two families shared a common kitchen, and Heinzen ridiculed Struve's vegetarianism, the latest fad of this irrepressible experimenter. Later, the Heinzens moved to two furnished rooms at 7 Hereford Road, Westbourn, London, for which they paid, heat and light included, nine shillings a week. The landlord had to take them in on faith, but eventually Heinzen was able to repay every penny he owed. Here the family stayed for nearly a year. Struve followed his friend into the same neighborhood, but presently a quarrel broke out which ended their friendship and provoked Heinzen to sarcastic attacks on Struve's idiosyncrasies. Apparently the trouble started over another one of Heinzen's plans for revolution. He showed it to Struve, who seemed to approve of its main outlines. The latter then submitted the plan to the London *Arbeiterverein*. Heinzen resented this method of giving it publicity and rather petulantly accused Struve of wanting to spoil the plan by launching it under such unfavorable auspices.

Heinzen found it difficult to earn money in London. He could find no publishers for his writings either in England or in Germany. Only the *Londoner Deutsche Zeitung*, that journalistic curiosity sponsored by the Grand Duke Karl of Brunswick,

would take his articles. The returns from tutoring French were meager, and Mrs. Heinzen could add little to the family purse by her needlework, in which she was an expert. Heinzen failed to get a job as clerk in a business house, perhaps because of his reputation for radicalism. The family was so poor that on the birthday of their five-year-old son the only gift the parents could afford was a sheet of paper, a lead pencil—and some string.

According to Heinzen's own account, English friends of Mazzini raised the money for his second trip to the United States and gave him food and clothing for the voyage. Heinzen paid his debts and started for America in the steerage of an immigrant ship. The Heinzens spent six weeks in the hold of the sailing vessel, with some three hundred Irish fellow-travelers, and Heinzen added one more description of filth, lice, moral degradation, and thievery to the gruesome literature of the immigrant traffic of the middle nineteenth century. His son contracted scarlet fever on the voyage but recovered. When the family landed in New York in the fall of 1850, their assets amounted to three dollars. Heinzen recorded in his recollections that he immediately drank three glasses of *Lagerbier*, just to wash away the memories of the dreadful voyage and to celebrate his release from the dirty, smelly ship. Thus, at nearly forty-two years of age, Heinzen took up anew his fight for radicalism in the United States. Here he had complete freedom of the press, and here he carried on the fight, with courage, audacity, self-sacrifice, and unshakable devotion to his principles, for three decades.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE TRIALS AND STRUGGLES OF A RADICAL JOURNALIST

ON HEINZEN'S RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES in October, 1850, his reception was quite different from the welcome he had received two years earlier. Interest in the German revolution had died rapidly in New York and, with it, most of the sympathy for Heinzen. The latter's attack on Hecker, published in the *Schnellpost* in 1848, had alienated many influential German-Americans. When Heinzen announced a lecture on the revolution, only thirty-two persons turned out to hear him and to pay the twenty-five-cent admission charge to Shakespeare Hall, which he had obtained rent-free for the occasion. Thus Heinzen had to abandon any hope he may have had to make a living in America by lecturing. His family was, as usual, on the ragged edge of poverty, and his son, who had contracted scarlet fever on shipboard, was still far from well. Heinzen got a job gilding wooden frames at three dollars a week through the help of Wilhelm Wagenitz, the same "honest tanner" who had bought Heinzen's way into the *Schnellpost*. The family lived in a garret room in Hoboken and slept on the floor on sawdust mattresses.

Even under these disheartening circumstances Heinzen could not resist the urge to write for a cause. Presently, with the financial help of a friend, he issued a sample number of a new publication to be known as *Der Völkerbund*, after its ill-fated European

prototype. In the prospectus Heinzen announced that Ruge and Mazzini would contribute to his new journal, that it would sell at eight cents a copy, or for twenty cents a month, and that it would be issued from offices at 77 Chatham Street, New York. The first issue, which appeared in November, 1850, contained, among other things, one stanza of the poem which the editor had dedicated to Hutten on the occasion of his visit to the latter's burial place in Switzerland several years earlier, an essay on "courage," and a vigorous, personal attack on Brentano's record in the revolution and on his paper, the *Leuchtturm*, which he had begun to publish in the United States. Not enough copies of the sample edition of the *Völkerbund* were sold to make a second issue possible.

At this point the editorship of the *Deutsche Schnellpost* was offered to Heinzen again, and by the end of January, 1851, he was publishing his old paper. Ownership of the *Schnellpost* had changed hands three times during his absence from the United States.

Throughout 1848, Tyssowski, "a brave and noble spirit," had been in charge while Heinzen was in Europe. Tyssowski sent his absent colleague several statements of his accounts, to show the precarious state of their undertaking, and urged that the paper be sold in order to stop further losses. He also suggested, as tactfully as possible, that some of his partner's contributions had raised controversies in German-American circles which lost the paper many subscribers. But when Tyssowski hinted that the only way to avoid bankruptcy would be to convert the *Schnellpost* into a Democratic paper and solicit government advertising, Heinzen indignantly rejected the proposal as unworthy of a free and independent journal. For a time, Tyssowski kept the paper alive by withholding for his own use funds that were intended for his partner's revolutionary activities abroad. He was unable to pay the rent or all the wages of his one typesetter. New stocks of paper could be bought only for cash, and frequently there were not more than five or six

dollars in the money drawer. Nevertheless, when Tyssowski finally sold his interest in the *Schnellpost*, Heinzen criticized him for lack of courage. In 1851, when Heinzen assumed the editorship again, the paper had its third new owner.

Heinzen immediately transformed the *Schnellpost* into a journal of propaganda and opinion. He attacked slavery and the churches, championed woman's rights and atheism, and, needless to say, raised a storm of controversy in German circles. He resolved "to pound [his reforms] in with a club"; he would force people to listen to the truth as he saw it; he would steer clear of all party ties and commitments and remain absolutely independent; and he would persist in his resolution to jog the German element in America out of its dull and self-satisfied materialism and bring in the age of reason. In later years he looked back to these early journalistic ventures with complete satisfaction and without regret. They demonstrated conclusively that freedom really existed in the United States.

Heinzen, from the outset, was ignored by most of his journalistic colleagues in New York. But he became embroiled quite early with the Communist press and the *New Yorker Staatszeitung*, which became his particular *bête noir*. The *Staatszeitung* ridiculed the ambitions of this "green" newcomer to force his political and social reforms on the American people by means of a new political party and referred to Heinzen, in the unrestrained journalistic style of the day, as "a Dutch recruit with the long legs of progress," "the banker of the revolution," "the boor with the expansive spirit," and a "freshman" who should wait at least until he had become naturalized before trying to rebuild America. The *Staatszeitung* disposed of professional revolutionists as "European beer politicians" who plunder American pocketbooks. The object of such unmerited abuse replied in kind and expressed his contempt for editors who could not write decent German and who produced their papers by using scissors and paste pot. His friends, as well as a former part owner of the *Schnellpost*, warned Heinzen that his readers were becoming

weary of his extreme radicalism and his unbridled attacks on religion.

Quarrels with his partner about editorial policy led the latter to abandon the enterprise, leaving the paper and its debts to Heinzen. A new partnership with M. Otto led to another quarrel over policies and ended in foreclosure proceedings. Otto wrote to a friend that he was abandoning the enterprise, although another fifty dollars might have kept it alive, simply because he could not get on with his radical editor, who had blocked several plans to sell the paper to a company sponsored by Friedrich Kapp and Heinrich Hoff, New York lawyers who had advanced money in order to keep the enterprise afloat.¹ Heinzen stubbornly maintained that he had invested his "intellectual capital" in the undertaking and therefore should have the determining voice in the management of the paper.

To save the *Schnellpost* for its crusading editor, a certain "worthy and honest citizen," as Heinzen described him, organized a stock company, to sell a thousand shares at five dollars a share. When this plan collapsed, it was decided to let the *Schnellpost* be sold at sheriff's sale and to use what money had been raised to start a new paper. Eichthal's old paper died on September 1 and was succeeded the next day by the *New Yorker Deutsche Zeitung*. Heinzen took his old circulation lists with him and claimed the new paper as his personal organ. His salary was fixed at fifteen dollars a week, with a percentage of the profits, graduated up to 25 per cent, provided the paper cleared as much as ten dollars per week. In spite of several claims to the contrary, Heinzen's records show that the *Schnellpost* and its Sunday edition, the *Sonntagsblatt*, never had more than seventeen hundred paid-up subscribers. These were widely scattered throughout the United States and abroad. About two hundred and fifty New Yorkers subscribed for the paper. The Sunday

¹ Heinzen MSS. Cf., especially, a three-page leaflet issued by Hoff and Kapp, August 13, 1851, recounting the various sales, contracts, mortgages, and claims in the course of the controversy over ownership and control.

edition had most of its readers outside the city, with subscriptions coming from Cleveland, Baltimore, Boston, Hartford, Newport, Rhode Island, Louisville, Indianapolis, and other western cities. Exchange copies were mailed to Paris, Amsterdam, Havre, Lyons, and Strassburg; to Theobald Moras in Brussels, to Carl Hagedorn in Bremen, to Freiligrath in London; to workers' clubs in Geneva; and to European papers like the *Londoner Deutsche Zeitung*, the *Hamburg Schnellpost*, the *Bremer und Weser Zeitungen*, and the *Brüsseler Deutsche Zeitung*.

Heinzen kept his accounts in a very haphazard fashion, on loose slips of paper, with all kinds of markings on them. A balance sheet for the period from September 1 to September 18, 1851, showed receipts of \$160.29 and expenses of \$159.98. A similar statement for a longer period, from March through July, showed receipts of \$2,213.03 and expenditures of \$3,765.69. The subscription rate was five dollars per year for the *Schnellpost* and three dollars for the Sunday edition. The editor was constantly harassed by demands for payment on his promissory notes and found it extremely difficult to meet his meager pay roll.

The *Schnellpost* and its *Sonntagsblatt* were in a real sense the forerunners, in style and format, of Heinzen's better-known and relatively more successful *Der Pionier*. It contained poetry, serial stories, and adventure tales, and its European correspondence was extensive and of good quality. Some of Heinzen's poems were first published here. In spite of a decidedly anti-Catholic point of view, the paper carried advertisements for the sale of Bibles, alongside the usual announcements of restaurants, concerts, books, theaters, and miscellaneous small businesses. It advocated equality for women and opposed temperance legislation. It printed literary criticisms, articles from the *Revue des deux mondes*, long accounts of the activities of freethinking societies in the United States, excerpts from Lamartine, scientific articles of every description, and odds and ends of interesting information. The paper reflected the great talents and the in-

corruptible honesty of its editor and, from the point of view of style and contents, represented a high standard of journalism. Heinzen considered the *Schnellpost*, along with five others, "not published in New York,"² as the best paper in the United States. In America he continued a practice which he had started abroad, namely, to spell "Deutsch" and "Deutschland" with a *t* instead of a *d*, and he argued at length that this was the original usage in the Old High German, that he preferred the "hard, strong *t* to the weak, soft *d* sound," and that, in any case, he proposed to spell the name of his fatherland as he pleased.

Heinzen had a completely free hand in managing the *New Yorker Deutsche Zeitung*. Unfortunately, instead of selling \$5,000 worth of stock, as had been planned, Heinzen had to start with \$1,300 and had to invest the entire amount in printing equipment, leaving nothing for operating capital. Moreover, much of the subscription money had been collected in advance for the *Schnellpost*. During its existence the *Deutsche Zeitung* carried a remarkable amount of foreign news and special correspondence from the leading capitals of Europe. It published serially the work of Heinzen's friend, Amand Gögg, entitled *Ein Blick in die sociale Geschichte der Völker*, and long exchanges between Ruge and the editor on the status of freedom in the United States, especially in the field of religion. It attacked the corrupt politics of New York, exposed the low standards of professional education in the United States, and contained the usual amount of controversial discussion of the Revolution of 1848.³

On December 4, 1851, after about three months of hopeless struggle, the *Deutsche Zeitung* collapsed. Heinzen claimed that its weekly edition had been built up to fifteen hundred readers and that two hundred dollars in cash would have saved the paper. In his "farewell," announcing the impending sale of his

² *Sonntagsblatt der Deutschen Schnellpost*, June 29, 1851.

³ See *Wochenblatt der New Yorker Deutsche Zeitung*, November 26, 1851; also an article in the *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*, March 28, 1886.

journal at public auction, the editor lamented that apparently, for lack of funds, he would be silenced here, as he had been abroad. But he restated his devotion to his principles and recalled with satisfaction and comfort that Socrates and Jesus also had spoken at one time only for a minority.

Early in 1852 Heinzen was again deeply involved in plans for a new journal. With the aid of Wagenitz, who had supported his earlier ventures, Heinzen launched a weekly, to be known as the *Janus*. It was issued from the same building on Williams Street from which came a paper published by Struve, for that redoubtable journalist had arrived in New York and, true to Heinzen's prediction, had at once started an American edition of his *Deutsche Zuschauer*. The *Zuschauer* and *Janus* appeared in the same format and were printed from the same type.

In the 1850's the German section of New York extended along upper William Street and into the neighboring streets from Pearl to Beckman streets, and Heinzen's activities in New York centered largely in this area. Here was the gathering place of the "Forty-eighters," and many refugees lived in the small, two-story houses on William Street. It was a region marked by many comfortable and pleasant taverns, German stores, and German beer saloons. On the corner of Duane and William streets stood Eugen Liever's Shakespeare Hall, where all German meetings were held, including those of the Socialistischer Turnverein, and where one could attend orchestra concerts on Sunday for 12½ cents admission. The *New Yorker Staatszeitung* was published at 214 William Street, and Rudolph and Friedrich Lexow's *New Yorker Kriminalzeitung* (later known as the *Belletristisches Journal*) and Pater Oertel's *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* were issued near by. The cigar stores of two refugees from Baden served as headquarters for the German exiles from that state, and Joseph Fickler, revolutionist and friend of Heinzen, ran a restaurant on Duane and William streets. Amand Gögg, the two German Communists, Wilhelm Weitling and Franz Arnold, Rösler von Oels, a former member of the Ger-

man Parliament and now master of a German-American school at Oliver and Henry streets, and many other refugees were among the interesting contemporaries of Heinzen in this German section of New York.

The *Janus*, established in 1852, acquired a majority of the subscribers of its predecessor, the *Deutsche Zeitung*, and was edited in the same general style and sold for four dollars a year. To help support the paper, as well as to raise new funds for the revolution, Heinzen undertook a lecture tour in the spring of 1852, leaving his old ally in revolution, Joseph Fickler, in charge of his editorial office during his absence. Unfortunately, this speaking tour overlapped the hard-fought political campaign of the same year and turned out to be a complete failure. At Philadelphia thirty-six came to Heinzen's first lecture, and thirteen to the second; but the German singers of the city honored the speaker with a serenade and a "beer evening." In Cincinnati, Heinzen attacked the Democratic party for its close affiliation with southern slaveholders and was hooted down and had to be escorted to his hotel by friends. Similar disturbances occurred in Dayton, Toledo, and Chicago, and the whole undertaking turned out to be such a complete failure that it greatly embittered Heinzen toward many of his fellow German-Americans. Fortunately, some of his addresses were reprinted in the *Janus*.

The contents of the *Janus* followed the pattern of its predecessors. Franz Sigel sent correspondence from London, until he broke with the editor because of his attitude on slavery. Ruge contributed poetry. Many columns were devoted to foreign news, with special emphasis on Germany, and the editorials revealed the familiar Heinzen attitude on slavery, temperance, penology, religion, education, woman's rights, and political and social reform. The *Janus* carried few advertisements and was in financial difficulties almost from the outset. Beginning in April, the paper appeared three times a week, though with fewer pages; but by the end of the month the editor went back to a

weekly edition, apparently at the request of his readers. During the first three months of its existence, when no advance payments were required, the *Janus* had nearly eight hundred subscribers. By the third quarter the figure had dropped to four hundred, and, of this number, only about half had actually made their payments. By the end of the year only a third had paid, and Heinzen and Wagenitz considered reducing the price to two dollars a year, in the hope of getting additional readers. The few political advertisements secured in the fall of 1852 from the offices of the local sheriff and of the secretary of state of New York were not enough to keep the *Janus* solvent.

On October 13 Heinzen published a humorous "Funeral Oration for the *Janus*." He compared his journalistic talents with those of Greeley of the *Tribune*, a paper which, in spite of its interest in temperance and spirit rappings, he always considered the best and noblest organ of personal journalism in the United States. Heinzen deplored the intellectual stagnation of the German-Americans which made them indifferent to a truly liberal and independent journal of opinion. As a matter of fact, Heinzen frequently received more recognition in non-German circles than among his own countrymen. The *New York Tribune* translated and published several of his lectures, and papers like the *Washington National Era*, the *Chicago Daily Times*, and the *Cleveland True Democrat* spoke favorably of the *Janus*. Horace Greeley on July 13, 1852, wrote:

Of all the exiles whom the European revolution brought to our shores, none wields so trenchant, merciless and independent a pen as Mr. Charles Heinzen, now Editor of a weekly journal in this city, called the *Janus*. A radical democrat . . . avowing his opinions on religion, literature, politics or individuals, with perfect coolness and indifference to the opinions of the majority, he necessarily often shocks the feelings of his readers and makes foes where he might make friends, but he also often tells the truth.⁴

Such recognition warmed the heart of the irrepressible reformer but did not replenish his empty bank account. On December 22, 1852, the *Janus* expired.

⁴ Reprinted in *Pionier*, January 4, 1865.

An attempt to borrow money to publish his lectures proved unsuccessful, and a second lecture tour, which brought out an audience of five in Albany, was a greater failure than the first. The Heinzens moved to South Brooklyn, and then back to New York again, and on several occasions the head of the house had to resort to pawnshops to keep his family alive. At one time he considered starting a boarding-house. At this critical moment in his affairs, Heinzen received an offer to edit the *Herold des Westens* in Louisville, Kentucky. The paper had its own printing establishment, and Heinzen promptly accepted, and during the three months he edited the paper he gained some five hundred new subscribers.

Louisville, in the 1850's, had an active German community, which included many "Forty-eighters" and radical workers' groups. It was proud of its *Liederkrantz*, *Freier Gesellschaftsbund*, *Turnverein*, German theater, German school, freethinkers' club, and other evidences of cultural and intellectual vigor. The more radical elements were eager to secure the services of "the great Karl" for the *Herold des Westens*, which they had started in competition with two other papers already established in the city,⁵ and Heinzen promptly obliged by proclaiming his antislavery views, in his usual uncompromising language, in a slave state. Almost at once he was the storm center of another controversy.

Heinzen's enemies promptly circulated stories, which the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* seemed eager to reprint without verification, to the effect that Heinzen had cheated the owners of the paper, had accepted liquor advertisements and was frequently drunk, and had consorted with a mulatto. Only one of these charges was true, namely, that he had serious differences with J. L. Holocher, the owner of the paper. Five years later the two men were still feuding over their respective obligations, and Holocher filed an affidavit accusing his associate of waste and extravagance in printing too large editions, of buying unneces-

⁵ See "Aus Louisvilles Vergangenheit," in *Der Deutsche Pionier* (Cincinnati), 1, 46-50.

sary books, and of failure to repay seventy dollars which he had advanced for Heinzen's trip from New York to Kentucky. Heinzen replied that Holocher had diverted income from subscriptions to his private use.

Far more important than this undignified controversy was the fact that Heinzen's radicalism, and especially his abolitionism, split the Louisville Germans into two violently antagonistic groups. What might eventually have happened to the *Herold des Westens* it is impossible to say, for on the night of December 3, 1853, its office and printing-shop burned to the ground. Heinzen believed that the fire was of incendiary origin; others charged that Heinzen himself was the incendiary and hoped to collect the insurance. The evidence indicates, however, that the fire was entirely accidental.⁶

After the fire a group of radical, freethinking Germans in Louisville resolved to help Heinzen launch a new paper. The latter's records show that some two hundred and sixty friends of the radical cause subscribed amounts varying from \$5 to \$50 for the new undertaking. In return some were to receive free subscriptions and free advertising; a few were repaid in cash in a short time; and the majority accepted Heinzen's promissory notes. Many of these notes later were rediscounted at a loss, and as late as 1869 Heinzen was still making payments to some of his creditors. In spite of an enthusiastic beginning, only \$885 were raised—just enough to acquire the bare necessities for printing and to leave a working capital of \$25. The cost of the first week's operation was \$60. Heinzen's records give itemized information on the cost of equipment, on the purchase of type from a Cincinnati foundry, on credit, and on the many other difficulties Heinzen encountered in trying to take care of his various accounts. Heinrich Börnstein, a St. Louis publisher with whom Heinzen later quarreled over politics, wrote in November, 1854, to offer to indorse a note of \$100 for three months and also agreed to send him some type. F. Glücklich, an im-

⁶ See *Die Turn Zeitung*, November 16, 1858.

pecunious newspaperman in Davenport, Iowa, offered to indorse a note to a Philadelphia firm for six months, provided he could have a mortgage, "for his family's sake," on the new printing-shop. Friedrich G. Walther, erstwhile publisher of a little sheet known as the *Rattenkönig*, wrote from New York to offer his colleague his old type on the instalment plan; and Gottfried von der Heyde, of Cleveland, suggested a partnership.

Under these precarious conditions, with many promises of help, high hopes, and little cash, Heinzen started the paper which he was to edit, in one place or another, for more than a quarter of a century and on which his chief fame as an American radical rests. He called it *Der Pionier*. Housing his family in quarters that rented for ten dollars a month and shunning no sacrifice, he began anew to create the kind of organ of truth and justice in which he believed. The paper inherited subscriptions from its immediate predecessor, and new readers were secured not only in Kentucky but in New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa, Alabama, and other remote areas—evidence of the power of Heinzen's name and the reputation he had among liberals and radicals throughout the United States.

The *Pionier* was in serious straits from the first and lived on precariously from issue to issue. By October, 1854, its owner decided to move the paper to Cincinnati. He had been unable to pay his workmen, and receipts were running steadily behind his expenses. He could neither take his press with him, nor pay for it, nor redeem the many notes he had signed. So Heinzen appealed to his creditors to release him from his financial obligations, although he promised to pay them at some later time. Twenty-nine signed the release, and Heinzen surrendered his press to one of his largest creditors. For years afterward he corresponded with men in Louisville who pressed him for a repayment of their loans or wrote to untangle the confused financial situation which had arisen from frequent rediscounting of these

debts. Heinzen made every possible effort to meet his obligations, and because some of the original subscribers gave him all the time he needed, Christian Essellen, publisher of the *Atlantis*, charged in 1858 that Heinzen had inveigled the people of Louisville into giving him a printing establishment. Heinzen replied that half his debts had been paid and that the rest would have been liquidated had it not been for the Panic of 1857.

One outstanding achievement made Heinzen's short stay in Louisville memorable. In March, 1854, he promoted a mass meeting of radical Germans of the city to adopt a political platform which should serve as a basis for a "reform party." Ever after, this declaration of principles was referred to in German-American circles as the "Louisville platform." It remained a rallying point for German radicals in America and a storm center of controversy among the German-American group. Heinzen, in this appeal "To All True Republicans in the Union," restated the slogans of "Liberty, Prosperity, and Education for All," which he had used in Europe and pointed out how these ideals, though technically embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution, had never been fully realized in America. He struck out boldly against slavery and all class and racial privileges, against the blind partisanship of the old party leadership, and against the sinister influences of clericalism. The Louisville platform demanded the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, no further extension of slavery, and its gradual abolition wherever it existed. It called for free land for actual settlers, easier methods of acquiring citizenship and a special office of colonization and immigration, protection of labor, social legislation, lower tariffs, a system of national internal improvements, including a Pacific railroad; equal rights for women and free Negroes; penal reforms; certain governmental changes (to be discussed later); reforms in education and the administration of justice; safeguards against the "anti-republican, anti-democratic, highly dangerous Roman Hierarchy," and an end of America's policy of isolation and neutrality.

The platform was a remarkable document in the literature of social protest and reform. Heinzen championed its principles for the rest of his career, and for a brief period it may be said that the Louisville office of the *Pionier* was the real headquarters of the "free German" movement in the United States. Unfortunately, the *Freimännervereine*, to which Heinzen expected his platform to appeal, quarreled about its details and indulged in controversies as bad as the narrowest sectarian conflicts. Heinzen himself savagely attacked a comparable declaration of principles issued by the "Free Germans of Ohio" and sponsored by Christian Essellen's *Atlantis*; and, when Friederich Hassaurek's Cincinnati *Hochwächter* suggested that other matters were more important in the field of practical politics, the two men became involved in a bitter polemic war over the relative merits of the ideal and the practical and remained enemies the rest of their lives.

The *Pionier* appeared somewhat irregularly in Cincinnati from November, 1854, to June, 1855. The Heinzens lived above the bookstore of Eggers and Wilde on Main Street. Here they had their residence, editorial office, and printing shop, and Mrs. Heinzen helped set type for her husband's paper. "They were the most industrious and peaceful people in the world," their landlord recalled later, and "lived together most happily and contentedly."

After a little more than six months in Cincinnati, a gift from a friend in New York made it possible for Heinzen to move his paper east again. In spite of the depression of 1857, which sharply reduced subscriptions and virtually ended all advertising, Heinzen managed to keep the *Pionier* alive as a weekly in New York City for the next three and a half years. The family found living quarters, and space for their printing-office, at 22 Howard Street, above the rooms of a violin-maker, and the intrepid editor renewed his thankless job of raising the level of German-American journalism and forcing a discussion of issues hitherto diplomatically avoided. The radicalism of the *Pionier*

was immediately assailed not only by leading German-language papers in New York and Philadelphia but by papers as far inland as Illinois and Texas.

The subscription rates for the weekly *Pionier* were \$1.00 for four months, \$3.00 for the year, with single issues selling at 7 cents. Advertising was at the rate of five lines for 25 cents for one insertion, 60 cents for three, 75 cents for a month, and \$5.00 for a whole year; up to ten lines, the cost was 50 cents for one issue, \$1.25 for a month, and \$8.00 for a year. Because of the limited type available, pages 1, 8, 4, and 5 were printed first, and pages 2, 3, 6, and 7 next.

After a few months the printing-office was moved to a back room at 37 Chambers Street, and the family took quarters on the third floor of a house at 54 Ludlow Street. Shortly thereafter the office was moved back into the family residence. The hostile *New Yorker Staatszeitung* reported in July, 1856, that its radical competitor had only five hundred and fifty subscribers, in contrast with its own fifteen thousand daily readers. Heinzen replied heatedly that it was quality and not quantity that mattered and that his circulation lists totaled nearly twelve hundred. He pointed with pride to the fact that his paper was the only one that required its subscribers to pay in advance, that he used no tricks or devices to build circulation, and that he stopped sending the paper the moment a subscription was allowed to lapse. Heinzen's records, at the time, showed a circulation of 294 in New York, 145 in Ohio, 106 in Massachusetts, 92 in Illinois, 73 in Kentucky, 62 in Missouri, 53 in California, 45 in Texas, 33 each in Wisconsin and Louisiana, and scattered readers in other states. Next to New York City, with 225 subscribers, the *Pionier* had its greatest circulation in Boston. To add to the editor's troubles, men who had volunteered to act as agents for the distribution of his paper on several occasions stole the money paid them for subscriptions.

Advertisements in the *Pionier* reflected a cross-section of German-American community life. They included announce-

ments by German doctors, lawyers, and other professional men; by druggists, veterinarians, photographers, and shoemakers; want ads from newly arrived immigrants; advertisements of railroads and steamship lines and land offices eager to attract immigrant business; announcements of immigrant hotels, book-dealers, consular offices, private schools, art and fencing academies, restaurants, saloons, wine and tobacco shops. Frequently, the editor advertised his own pamphlets and books for sale. In addition, the paper carried more personal notices, requests for the addresses of missing family members, and for employment, and on rare occasions even an announcement dissolving a marriage and announcing a new matrimonial arrangement without benefit of clergy. Almost every issue of the *Pionier* contained advertisements of impending lectures, concerts, masquerade balls, dramatic entertainments, *Turnfeste*, and other social and cultural activities so characteristic of German-American communities. Heinzen refused advertisements which he knew to be fraudulent and constantly attacked his competitors for their lack of principle in this regard. When they replied by twitting the editor of the *Pionier* for advertising European lotteries, his rejoinder was that he had investigated the operation of these state and municipal lotteries and had found them to be honestly administered. The nation-wide circulation of the *Pionier* accounts for the fact that many advertisements were sent in from other states, such as Kentucky, Ohio, New Jersey, Michigan, and Missouri. Needless to add, advertising in a paper like the *Pionier* was never a source of much income and rose and fell in quick response to fluctuations in the business cycle. In certain large eastern cities, like Baltimore and Philadelphia, the paper was never popular. On the other hand, it was rather widely read among the relatively much smaller German element in Boston. Heinzen was invited to lecture there in 1856, and on that occasion he received a gift of fifty dollars to help him pay an honorarium to a foreign correspondent. A similar contribution came from Missouri. Millard Fillmore, ever the calculating

politician, stopped his carriage before the *Pionier* office in New York in 1856 to order six subscriptions. By 1857 Heinzen had built a circulation of about twelve hundred.

In June, 1857, the *Pionier* moved again, this time to 274 Bowery Street. Here the paper was edited and printed in the basement, while Mrs. Heinzen, in partnership with Theresia Kohn, operated a small millinery and "fancy work" shop on the first floor, to help meet her husband's expenses. A few months later the partnership was dissolved, and Mrs. Heinzen continued to sell hats and needlework alone. The Panic of 1857 almost ruined the *Pionier*, and Heinzen made desperate efforts to keep it alive. He juggled his subscription price and the size of the paper, to four cents for a single issue of only four pages. He tried to get more job printing, and he moved several times in one year in order to reduce his expenses. Advertising fell off to practically nothing, and with the aid of his wife he did all the work alone for a time. In those better periods when he could afford paid help, the man who ran his press generally made more money than the owner himself. Again and again, he had to apologize to his readers for defective issues of the paper, and he accused Democratic postmasters of deliberately refusing to deliver his paper. In these lean years—indeed, at any point in his career—Heinzen would have been happy to earn eight hundred to a thousand dollars a year. He deplored the fact that he had so little time to do the reading and studying necessary to produce a respectable paper, and he was particularly disappointed that he could not pay for European correspondence or for original literary work produced by Germans in the United States.

For a short time after the Panic of 1857, subscriptions dropped so low that Heinzen urged readers who really valued the *Pionier* to pay what they could, or even "in kind," and regretted that he could not distribute it free. "I want the *Pionier* to be read," he said, "not just paid for." "We want honest readers, or none at all." The continued publication of the *Pionier* became a matter of honor and principle with Heinzen. It was

never a commercial enterprise, and Heinzen would have preferred to see the paper perish rather than deviate in the slightest degree from his high standards of independent journalism. By the end of 1857 the receipts, allowing the modest sum of \$460, plus the slight income from advertisements, for the support of Heinzen's family, did not amount to one-fourth the expenses.

Early in 1858 the constable arrived to confiscate Heinzen's little library and his wife's millinery business, for failure to pay a note of \$100 which he had indorsed for his wife when the latter dissolved her partnership with Theresia Kohn. Heinzen's books were sold at auction. Mrs. Kohn's husband—"Shylock II"—bought them. Again, the family moved, this time to 196 Grand Street, and the printing-office was transferred to the third floor of 37 Frankfort Street. In the fall of 1858 Heinzen began to make plans to move the *Pionier* to Boston. On November 21 he announced a "farewell lecture" in New York to raise money to pay his European correspondent, Karl Blind, who had received no pay for his services save the fifty dollars donated by Boston friends. About one hundred and fifty people attended the lecture, and the net proceeds amounted to forty dollars, which Blind immediately returned with the request that it be used for propaganda purposes in the United States.

In Boston on January 6, 1859, the *Pionier* celebrated its sixth birthday. Heinzen's spirits ran high as he looked forward to many years of success in the land of the Pilgrims and "the cradle of liberty." He considered Boston the center of free-thought in America, in the realm both of politics and of religion, for the *Boston Investigator* and William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* were published there, and he believed that this "Athens of America" was far more receptive to German culture than New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore. Boston had no Tammany Hall, no *New Yorker Staatszeitung*, no inherited prejudices against Heinzen! Nearly four hundred people had come to hear him when he lectured there a year and a half earlier, and his audience had included many native Americans, Theodore Parker

among them. The whole experience had reacted upon the harassed New Yorker as "a spiritual vacation." He described Boston as "the most civilized [city] in America," and its German population as "the most decent in the United States, and the most genuinely interested in radical causes."⁷

With high hopes, Heinzen began his labors in the intellectual hub of America in an atmosphere more congenial than any he had ever known. He was destined to remain in Boston to the end of his days. The Heinzens were ordered out of their first house on Carver Street when the owner discovered that the premises were being used as a print shop. Presently, they leased a brick house on Oak Street for \$450 a year plus water tax, from a plumber, Abijah Fessenden, and here, diagonally across from the Boston Turner Hall, the family took up its residence and the *Pionier* was published. Heinzen's creditors continued to press him for payment for new type which he had bought, and many Bostonians complained that the *Pionier* carried so little local news. Heinzen replied that he had no intention of making the *Pionier* a local newspaper. It was an "organ of radicalism" and should be as readable in Oregon as in Massachusetts. Five-sixths of its subscribers lived outside Boston. Boston Germans, whose main interest was in a convivial *Vereinsleben*, also complained that they never saw the new editor in saloons or restaurants, where he might "treat" his friends and make new connections. Again Heinzen replied that he preferred to live quietly at home and that he did not intend to change his long-established habits in order to become popular or make money.

In August, 1859, Heinzen tried to persuade the Turner organization of America to adopt the *Pionier* as its official organ. Both stood for more or less the same type of radicalism, and Heinzen thought that the support of the Turner would enable him to enlarge his paper and increase its effectiveness. *Die Turn Zeitung* replied sarcastically that Heinzen merely wanted to be bailed out of debt again, and the only results of the proposal

⁷ *Pionier*, June 1, 1856.

were strained relations with the *Turnerbund* for a number of years, and a sharp controversy between the editor of the *Pionier*, and Wilhelm Rothacker, editor of the Turner paper,⁸ with whom Heinzen hitherto had been on cordial terms. Rothacker deeply offended his friend by attributing the success of the *Pionier* to Adolf Douai, the editorial collaborator of "the Olympian of Boston." Almost simultaneously, Heinzen was involved in another unfortunate newspaper controversy with Charles L. Bernays, of the St. Louis *Anzeiger des Westens*, because of a loan of one hundred dollars which Heinzen had requested in order to save his wife's millinery business.

Early in 1860 Heinzen advertised rooms for rent in his modest lodgings. He was so discouraged that he complained bitterly of his isolation in America. At fifty years of age, without money or influence, he had accomplished little here or abroad. "It is hard to swim against the current," he wrote, "but it is upstream that one finds the source, and the clearer, fresher water." In 1861 the *Pionier* office was moved to 419 Washington Street. It lost three hundred readers in the South due to secession, but it made new friends among the German regiments of the Union Army. In 1862 the price was raised to eight cents an issue, owing to a sharp rise in the cost of paper, and the following year the *Pionier* was reduced to the smaller format of the old *Janus*. Old friends in Louisville and elsewhere continued to send small contributions for the cause. On January 4, 1865, Heinzen reviewed his twelve years of effort for the paper so dear to his heart. His material success was nil, and his circulation list was no larger than in the first year of the *Pionier*'s existence. He admitted that his own "unsparing language" had lost him at least two thousand readers, and yet he insisted that without his straightforward methods the paper would be superfluous in America, which already had too many German-language publications.

Early in 1866 the paper was moved again to offices on Winter

⁸ See *Die Turn Zeitung*, October 4, 1859.

Street, and, thanks to the gift of a friend, who sent him type formerly used to print a Catholic paper, the *Pionier* appeared in new typographical dress. "Yesterday for the Lord, today against him," Heinzen commented with that sense of humor that seldom deserted him. Friends of the radical cause planned to raise \$10,000 to enable Heinzen to increase the size and usefulness of the *Pionier*. Actually, \$1,705 were collected—not enough to justify expansion, but Heinzen was deeply affected by this friendly gesture, which came at a time when he was recuperating from a serious illness. He used the money to pay some of his European correspondents and invested \$200 in European periodicals and books, for he spent half of each day in reading and hunting for material that might prove appropriate for the *Pionier*.

In the years that followed, Heinzen moved his editorial office several times, but the family came to rest at last in the home of his devoted friend and fellow-radical, Dr. Marie E. Zakrzewska, on Cedar Street, in Roxbury. Without her support, and that of Louis Prang, it is doubtful whether Heinzen could have weathered several of the crises he encountered in his later years.

Heinzen spent the last twenty years of his life in the Zakrzewska home in Roxbury. Here he lived with his family and a remarkable group of women which at one time included not only the doctor and her two sisters but Julia A. Sprague, founder and teacher of one of the early kindergartens in Boston, and Mary Louise Booth, that precocious scholar, author, editor and translator of many languages, and radical abolitionist, who became editor of *Harper's Bazaar* in 1867. By his own admission, Heinzen always got on more easily with intellectual, radical women than with men of the same breed. Perhaps Heinzen's frustrated soul had a peculiar need for the adoration and respect these women were ready to give him. At any rate, the Heinzens moved into the spacious house of the doctor, as paying guests, and for years helped to support a somewhat peculiar but apparently harmonious, communal household.

Dr. Zakrzewska deserves a place in history as a pioneer woman physician and as the founder of the New England Hospital for Women and Children in Boston. She came from an old Polish family. Her grandfather had fled in 1793 to escape the despotism of the Russian czar and had abandoned the Catholic church to become a freethinker. Marie, his granddaughter, was born in Berlin in 1829. She was twenty years younger than Heinzen. Reared in poverty, as one of a large family, she prepared herself for a career in midwifery, and at the age of twenty-two was appointed chief *accoucheuse* in a Berlin hospital. In 1853 she came to New York. Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, a woman pioneer in medicine, assisted her to get admission to the Cleveland Medical College, where she was befriended and helped financially by Mrs. C. M. Severance and Dr. A. D. Mayo, a liberal clergyman. After completing what today would be considered a very brief period of medical training, Dr. Zakrzewska returned to New York, and with Emily Blackwell, a sister of Elizabeth, opened an infirmary for women. Later, she moved to Boston, where she had the chair of obstetrics at the New England Female Medical College, and, with the help of friends, founded the New England Hospital for Women and Children in Roxbury, an institution which remains to this day her lasting monument.

Like Heinzen, Dr. Zakrzewska was an ardent champion of equal rights. "I prefer to be remembered," she said on one occasion, "only as a woman who was willing to work for the salvation of woman." Like Heinzen, she mourned the failure of the German Revolution of 1848 and, like him, was a freethinker and an atheist, with a passion for social justice.⁹ Dr. Zakrzewska sought to alleviate the lot of the poor, being particularly concerned about Jewish children, and she established lunchrooms for working girls. A radical abolitionist, she counted Garrison, Phillips, Julia Howe, and Lucy Stone among her friends. She

⁹ Marie E. Zakrzewska to Mary L. Booth, September, 1859, in Caroline H. Dall, *A Practical Illustration of "Woman's Right To Labor"* (Boston, 1860), p. 102.

published papers on many subjects, such as the theater, public health, women's clubs, college dormitories, and the duties of physicians. She developed a practical program of nurses' training and at one time was considered the leading woman physician of Boston, and to hundreds who needed her help she was a good Samaritan.¹⁰

It is not clear how Heinzen and the doctor became acquainted, nor when they agreed to make common cause in their crusade for woman's rights and other reforms. The earliest references to Dr. Zakrzewska appear in the *Pionier* in 1857 in connection with an appeal for funds to expand into a full-fledged hospital the Infirmary for Indigent Women and Children, started in New York in 1854 as a dispensary by Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell. Heinzen took great pride in the achievements of his doctor friend and seized every opportunity to publicize them in the *Pionier*. He stressed the conventions and barriers erected against professional women and pointed to his friend as a model for the women of the nation to follow. He reprinted translations of her lectures, and Dr. Zakrzewska advertised her hospital in Heinzen's paper. Whenever appeals were made for funds for some reform in which Heinzen was interested, her name usually led the list of contributors. She gave generously to the fund raised to publish the collected works of her friend; as a member of the inner circle which published the *Pionier*, she was instrumental on more than one occasion in keeping it financially afloat; and she bitterly denounced the Germans for being so niggardly with their support. As Heinzen grew older, she was deeply troubled about the future of his paper, and it was she who, during his last illness, projected a plan to keep the *Pionier* alive by merging it with the *Freidenker* of Milwaukee.

The other loyal friend of the Heinzens who must be mentioned here because he, too, was an ever present help in days of

¹⁰ Agnes C. Victor, *A Woman's Quest: The Life of Marie F. Zakrzewska, M.D.* (New York, 1924); and *Marie Elizabeth Zakrzewska—a Memoir, 1829-1902* (Boston: New England Hospital for Women and Children, 1903).

trouble for the *Pionier* was Louis Prang. A refugee of 1848, he met the Heinzens when they moved to Boston, and here they became friends and virtual neighbors. Though experienced in art work before he left Germany, Prang learned in Boston the lithographing process that made him famous and prosperous. He introduced chromo-lithographing in the United States, and during the Civil War his business expanded so rapidly that in 1868 he was able to build his own factory in Roxbury. Prang was interested in other things besides his business and making money. He discovered Heinzen through the latter's writings; he became a staunch and influential friend of the German School in Boston; and he published "Prang's Natural History Series" in 1873 and *Prang's Aids for Objective Teaching* in 1877. His name has remained a valuable trade-name to this day.

The Heinzens and the Prangs became fast friends. On more than one occasion the prosperous Prang came to the aid of the *Pionier*, and he was so devoted to its editor that he contributed to practically all the causes which Heinzen sponsored and defended him virtually single-handed, on several critical occasions, when he was attacked by the Germans of Boston.¹¹

Louis Prang had married Rosa Gerber, a Swiss girl. Their daughter, Rosa, and Karl Peter, the son of the Heinzens, met in the Heinzen home on Oak Street, in Boston, when the boy was sixteen and the girl only seven, and were destined to unite the two families in marriage. Young Heinzen attended Boston Latin School and the Polytechnic Institute in Zurich, where he studied to be an architect. After his return to the United States, he worked for a short time with an architect in Boston and then went to Chicago to the firm of Fritz Baumann. He returned regularly to Boston at Christmas time for visits with his parents, and once Rosa Prang visited him in Chicago while on the way back from California with her parents. In 1873 the young couple were engaged, and on Christmas Day, 1875, they were married. Prang took his new son-in-law into his business, and the young

¹¹ Hermann Schuricht, "Louis Prang," *Der Deutsche Pionier*, XIII, 467-72.

people settled down in Boston to raise their family. The elder Heinzen and the elder Prang took deep satisfaction in this union of their families, and, when the first grandchild arrived, the Prangs and the Heinzens gathered in solemn ceremony to give the newcomer a name. In lieu of a "christening" or a "baptism," Grandfather Heinzen delivered an address and named the little girl after her maternal grandmother. He placed a copy of his remarks in the infant's hand. With several affectionate references to the grandmother from whom she got her name, he admonished the infant to use her "good heart" and her "clear intellect" in good will toward mankind; to love truth, the intellectual life, freedom, and the rights of man; and to defend the rights of her sex. The whole ceremony revealed a Teutonic sentimentality which was always present in Heinzen's nature but which on most occasions he struggled grimly to suppress.

Here we may leave the intimate Roxbury circle to return once more to the fortunes of the *Pionier*. Heinzen hailed the completion of the Atlantic cable as a veritable revolution in journalistic methods, but he never could afford telegraphic news himself and had to take his reports from the morning *Boston Journal*. Though on occasions, such as the nineteenth birthday of the *Pionier* in 1872, the editor received an anonymous gift of three hundred dollars, which he promptly spent for his "literary labors," and small sums from the publication of his lectures, he never could be sure of anything more than a meager, hand-to-mouth existence. All his life he yearned for a "German paper in English" which would reach native Americans, but he was neither sufficiently conversant with English himself, nor able to engage translators, to bring this about.

At the end of 1873, in the mellow mood that comes with age, Heinzen asked his faithful readers to send him their photographs, so that he might compile a *Pionier* album and see what "radical heads" look like. He received photographs from many places, including Europe, and by 1879 had a hundred and ninety in his collection, of whom twenty-nine were the likenesses of

friends already dead. In 1874 a sculptor in New York, who had made models of Goethe and Feuerbach, did a bust of Heinzen, and L. Prang and Company advertised copies for sale in the *Pionier* for twenty-five dollars, with an accompanying letter from the editor certifying that this was "a true copy of the original."

As the years exacted their toll of Heinzen's remarkable physical energy, it became clear even to him that the end of the *Pionier* was in sight. He struggled on beyond his paper's silver anniversary, though his circulation list was fading fast. In 1877, in correspondence with his devoted follower, Karl Schmemann, of Detroit, he pointed out that the ultimate destiny of any radical paper was bankruptcy.¹² He valued his press at eight hundred dollars, estimated his weekly expenses between fifty and sixty dollars, and marveled that the paper was still alive, for it now had but half its original number of subscribers and was steadily losing circulation. In 1878 the net return from subscriptions was three hundred dollars. Severe illness and the dishonesty of an assistant printer, whom he refused to prosecute, added to the old editor's burdens.

In May, 1878, Heinzen discussed a plan devised by Dr. Zakrzewska, Schmemann, and others to save the *Pionier* and the Milwaukee *Freidenker* by merging the two. Heinzen consented to a merger only after much haggling about the details. An agreement was finally concluded to have the papers appear thereafter as the *Pionier* and *Freidenker*, edited by C. Hermann Boppe, "with the collaboration of Karl Heinzen." The new publication was to be enlarged, and Heinzen was promised a small honorarium for his contributions, which proved few indeed, and a modest allowance for scientific books and exchanges, which he agreed to turn over to the paper when he had finished with them. Discussions of the proposed agreement dragged on into 1879, primarily because Heinzen was afraid that control by a stock company might affect the independence

¹² See Schmemann MSS, June 16, 1875.

of the paper. The negotiations with Milwaukee were finally consummated in 1880, when Prang and Dr. Zakrzewska agreed to pledge five hundred dollars each to the new stock company, and Heinzen took formal leave of his editorship. He continued to write an occasional article for the paper which now appeared as the *Freidenker*, with the subtitle, *Des Pionier, XXVII Jahrgang*, and with the same masthead, "Liberty, Prosperity, and Education for All." The new publishers in Milwaukee were Carl Dörflinger and F. E. Schmidt, a prominent Turner and a participant in the radical conventions of 1876 and 1879 in Philadelphia, in which Heinzen had played such an important role.¹³

The *Pionier* throughout its lifetime was a journal of opinion, an organ of highly personal journalism, and not a newspaper in the ordinarily accepted sense. It contained far less news than editorials, scientific articles, prose and poetic selections, and material more likely to be found in a periodical for intellectuals than in the daily press. Its entire contents expressed the convictions of the editor on political, economic, and social questions.

To select illustrations at random, the *Pionier* published articles on Darwinism, the history of materialism, "brain and soul," comets, glaciers, earthquakes and volcanoes, steam hammer and telegraph, anthropology, physics, and mineralogy; geographical studies of Mexico, Argentina, and Hawaii; essays on diet, spiritualism, astronomy, educational theory, and music criticism; reviews of Buckle's *History of Civilization*; discussions of the chemistry of wine, reform in the treatment of the insane, woman's status, and the meaning of dreams; literary notices; the letters of Goethe, Schiller, Frau Stein, and Körner; novels; the poems of Scott, Wordsworth, Herwegh, and Freiligrath; and bibliographies of German-American books and periodicals. In the "Feuilleton" of 1856, to take that year as an example, Heinzen reprinted revolutionary poems and novels; a digest of Michelet's *History of the Reformation in France*; ex-

¹³ See also *Freidenker-Almanach für das Jahr 1879*, and succeeding years, for reprints of Heinzen material.

tracts from Louis Blanc's *History of the French Revolution*; Humboldt's essays on creative force; articles on Chopin and George Sand; abolitionist tales by Harriet Beecher Stowe; selections from Poe and Dickens and Shelley; opera criticisms; Schubert's *Wanderjahre*; occasional humorous bits from the *Berliner Kladderadatsch*; and short treatises on blood transfusion and surgery.

The section dealing with European affairs was always excellent and the comments on foreign news far superior to those of any other German-language paper—and of most papers in the United States for that matter. Foreign news always received first place on the first page. A column, called "Notizen," represented Heinzen's own gleanings from a wide variety of news items, and his pungent comments on them, and many of his readers subscribed for the paper for this column alone. The *Pionier* featured all anniversaries related to the revolutionary movement the world over, especially those of Germany and the United States. It carried many appeals for aid for penniless exiles or refugees, and Heinzen, in spite of his meager resources, always headed the list of contributors.

Schiller, Freiligrath, and Herwegh were the poets most frequently quoted in the *Pionier*, primarily because of their devotion to liberty, but Goethe also figured frequently in Heinzen's "Feuilleton" selections.

The editor, in spite of his stern and combative nature, also had his humorous side. He derived much amusement from that variety of American humor which we call "tall tales," and he reprinted many of them in the *Pionier*. He added many a salty squib himself. He loved to publish "boners" culled from rival papers. He had a special gift for epigram. But his greatest talent was for powerful, blasting, biting invective, and he used it all too frequently to his own disadvantage. He recognized his weakness in this regard but apparently could not overcome his zest for personal combat. No other German-language editor made so many enemies unnecessarily, but no other paper had quite the

fire and spice of the *Pionier*. Its superb literary style was equaled by few of its contemporaries and excelled by none.

The *Pionier* was recognized as an unusual paper. It was frequently quoted, at home and abroad, and often without crediting the source. Its contents were noted by publications like the *Berlin Magazin für die Literatur des Auslands*, the *Urwähler* of Vienna, the *Kölnische Zeitung*, and the *Nordstern* of Hamburg. Disciples of Heinzen in Nuremberg sent their photographs for the *Pionier* album; a teacher in Saxony was a regular subscriber; and a reader in Dresden advertised for a complete file for the years from 1856 to 1875. In the United States a regular Heinzen cult among the radical Germans regarded him as the high priest of their cause and wrote to him from all over the country—from Texas, Illinois, Oregon, and elsewhere—to commend him for his services to the cause of honor, justice, goodness, and truth. The *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* found the *Pionier* more honorable, thoughtful, and decent than the Cincinnati *Hochwächter*. The liberal *Turn Zeitung* called the *Pionier* a “veritable oasis in the comfortless Sahara of our exchanges.” *Leslie’s Weekly* printed a biographical sketch and woodcut of Heinzen, and the *Nation* referred in laudable terms to some of his activities. Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison read the *Pionier*.¹⁴ The former referred to Heinzen as a “far-seeing, sagacious,” and courageous publicist,¹⁵ and Garrison regarded the *Pionier* as “the ablest, most independent, and highest toned of all the German papers in this country.”

¹⁴ Oscar Handlin, *Boston’s Immigrants, 1790–1865* (Cambridge, 1941), p. 177.

¹⁵ K. Peter, “Karl Heinzen,” *Open Court* (Chicago), I, 453.

CHAPTER SIX

HEINZEN THE MAN

NATURE ENDOWED HEINZEN WITH A MARVELOUS and impressive physique. His contemporaries referred to him as "der lange Karl," for he stood well over six feet. The passport issued to him by the Grand Duchy of Baden when he was forty years old described him as "slender," with an oval face and ruddy complexion, blond hair and eyebrows, blue eyes, a high forehead, an oval chin, good teeth, a reddish beard, and "with nine scars on his left cheek," reminders of the many duels he fought during the stormy semesters he spent as a student at the University of Bonn. The scars grew fainter with the passing years, but one near the corner of his mouth he carried with him to the grave. At fifty-six Heinzen had grown heavier and more plump, and for years his natural weight fluctuated between 210 and 220 pounds, dropping only once, after a short but severe illness, as low as 180.

Nearly everyone who knew Heinzen commented on the stern, straightforward look in his eyes and on his large and rather noble head. He had a broad mouth, sparkling and lively eyes, and, as might have been expected in a man so physically powerful, his hands and feet were unusually large. William Lloyd Garrison's son described him as a "striking and remarkable figure," "a man of massive intellect," "of noble stature and frame, a spacious temple for a great soul, his rugged face betraying his indomitable and fearless character."

In spite of the belligerent qualities that marked his journalistic career, Heinzen was unusually quiet in his demeanor, never talkative, generally reticent and even taciturn, and not a good conversationalist, though he could, on occasion, be a genial and even jovial companion, with a real sense of humor. Heinzen made no effort to be entertaining. For hours on end he sat alone and in silence in his study or in his garden, lost in thought. Some of his friends thought that he simulated a certain air of rusticity and was rather careless about his clothes. But this does not mean that he was careless about his person. He had the highest standards of personal cleanliness and hygiene; he kept his clothes well brushed and spotless and his linens clean; he greased his shoes, wore overshoes in bad weather, ordinary shirts instead of the stiff bosoms so common in his day, and always changed to a housecoat on his arrival at home. He repeatedly assailed his fellow-Germans for their indifference to their personal appearance.

Buffeted by fate and weighed down by poverty, the Heinzens had been pushed around from one place to another in Europe and America. On January 5, 1860, Heinzen completed his naturalization in the United States District Court of Boston, and in the spring of 1861 the family moved to the home of their friend and benefactor, Dr. Marie E. Zakrzewska, in Roxbury. In the garden at the rear of the Zakrzewska home, Heinzen planted fruit trees and flower beds and grape vines, terracing his grapes on the rising slope behind the house as was the custom in the wine country of the Rhineland, "a German grafting on a Yankee hillside." Trimming his vines and pruning his fruit trees was Heinzen's greatest recreation and pleasure. Thus he lived in a kind of "country house," situated at that time far from the busy city, and in such retirement that some of his friends chided him for his hermit existence. Heinzen was not a social person, but it would be wrong to call him antisocial. He did not seek companions, but his heart longed for companionship, and he cherished it deeply when it came his way. He had few close friends.

Most of his followers lived in distant cities, and he knew them only as names on his subscription lists. For a number of years his one steadfast companion was a big black Newfoundland dog, named "Faust," who accompanied his master day after day on his regular trips to the post office.

Heinzen was a man of simple habits. He read avidly and far more than most men. The task of editing the *Pionier*, practically single-handed, kept him extraordinarily busy, for half of the paper consisted of translations or selections culled from other authors and standard works. Again and again Heinzen bemoaned his deficiencies in languages, which made it very difficult for him to make his own translations, and his lack of funds, which kept him from employing someone else for the task. He seldom had the means to subscribe for the leading European periodicals. His wife spent many hours helping her husband make the selections printed in his "Notizen," and the entire family circle, including Miss Sprague and the Zakrzewskas, participated in the hunt for material for the *Pionier*.

Heinzen assembled noteworthy quotations from ancient and modern writers to use in his editorial work. His selections were made from Greek, Latin, German, and French authors, and he had a special liking for Cicero, though Horace, Livy, Pliny, Plato, Ovid, Voltaire, and Erasmus were also well represented. He apparently read extensively in Plutarch. From Virgil he selected the "Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas," which might well have been one of the mottos of his life. From Schiller he copied

Welche Religion ich bekenne? Keine von allen,
Die du mir nennst. Und warum keine?
Aus Religion.

From Novalis he selected "Ein Charakter ist ein vollkommen gebildeter Wille," and from Johann Paul, "Der Mensch ist der grosse Gedankenstrich im Laufe der Natur." Rousseau's "La suprême jouissance est dans le contentement de soi-même" ap-

pealed to him, and in a lighter, more romantic mood he had copied Molière's

Quand deux cœurs s'aiment bien,
Tout le reste n'est rien.

Selections like these are not without significance in revealing the man's inner self.

Mrs. Heinzen always helped her husband to dispatch the *Pionier*, and then, in the evening of the day when it was distributed, she would read the paper aloud as the family group sat around the parlor table. It was thus that Julia Sprague received her initiation into German radicalism. After each day's labor it was Heinzen's habit to gather his little group of female admirers about him and read to them from books which he considered significant. Then he usually played a little whist, or chess, with Dr. Zakrzewska and drank a glass or two of wine before retiring.

Heinzen was a temperate, almost abstemious, person, though never a total abstainer. He arose early, to a simple breakfast of bread and coffee. At ten or eleven, after the European fashion, the Heinzens had a more substantial breakfast, a "zweites Frühstück," usually consisting of meats left over from the preceding day. The family ate its main meal at five or six in the evening. Heinzen drank beer occasionally but with no great relish. Wine was his favorite drink. He planted several dozen varieties of grapes at the rear of his residence and reported the results of his experiments, together with articles on viniculture and wine-making, in the *Pionier*. He was fond of Hungarian wine and was especially successful with the Delaware grape. He claimed to have discovered waldmeister (*Asperula odorata*), a favorite with German wine-lovers, in the United States on a trip between Cleveland and Columbus in 1852. He wrote about the "poetic vine," and the "beautiful, aesthetic priceless fruit," with the soul of a poet and the scientific knowledge of an expert. One of his lectures, "About Eating and Drinking," was a clever, learned, and satirical discussion of the eating and drink-

ing habits of a people as they affected their politics, religion, and social life. With many philosophical observations, he analyzed the table of the British, the French, the Germans, and the Yankees and concluded that the German cuisine was the best, for it combined sentimentality, *Gemüthlichkeit*, "power, simplicity, and taste." For the utopia which he imagined would follow the revolution he proposed a ministry of public eating and drinking and a ministry of recreation to provide free folk festivals for all. He advocated transforming the Cologne Cathedral into a public recreation hall and facetiously suggested that every church be converted into an inn.

These literary fancies to the contrary notwithstanding, Heinzen was a vigorous champion of temperance. He drank his wine with the good taste of a gentleman. He loved good food, and his friends occasionally sent him bear and deer meat from the woods of Michigan or Pennsylvania. But he denounced the bock-beer festivals and the incessant beer-drinking of his German countrymen. He was sure that it made them stupid and quarrelsome and destroyed their interest in things worth while, and he maintained that if Germans had been more temperate with their beer, they would have had a republic long ago. He advocated German temperance societies and actually cited Henry Ward Beecher and Greeley and Wendell Phillips as evidence of the stimulating effect of temperance upon intellectual activity. In one of his most biting sentences he referred to Germans who rose "each day as a barrel of beer and went to bed each night as a beer barrel."¹ He hated tobacco even more than beer. He never used it himself, and it made him furious to have to attend radical meetings where the incessant smoking made his eyes burn and his clothes smell. He denounced the "stinking weed" with the fire of a fanatic and declared that "as long as men smoke tobacco, they are not free and will never be free."²

¹ "Mensch und Magen," in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (Boston, 1869), II, 313-50.

² Carlos von Gagnern, *Todte und Lebende, Erinnerungen* (Berlin, 1884), pp. 296, 298, 300.

On Sunday afternoons, after the German custom, the Heinzens were at home for coffee to their friends. The Garrisons, who lived in the neighborhood, frequently came in for these informal occasions, as did prominent Germans who happened to be in the city and sympathized with Heinzen's activities. Many who had admired him from afar as a mere name caught their first glimpse of the radical editor on these occasions. Wendell Phillips, Louis Elson, the music critic, and Carl Zerrahn, conductor of the Händel and Haydn Society, were among the more intimate circle of Heinzen's friends. Though he traveled rather extensively, Heinzen hated the dirt and noise and speed of trains, and he always looked forward to his return to his haven of peace and security on Cedar Street, where he lived meagerly enough but always among loving and appreciative friends and family.

Heinzen liked music and had a special fondness for the German zither. In New York he occasionally went to the opera. In Boston he sometimes attended concerts and balls given by German-American societies. Usually he complained that the halls were too cold, the air polluted with tobacco, and the drinks too cheap to be good. For the *Pionier* he wrote occasional articles on music and invited discussions of such subjects as the relation of music to rationalism. He contended that music belonged wholly in the realm of feeling and fantasy and depended entirely for its effect on the emotional capacity of the listener. Heinzen was convinced that the greatest musicians were less intellectual than poets and philosophers and that it was more difficult to compose "The Last Rose of Summer" than to write an opera.

Heinzen was a great lover of the outdoors, and he was passionately fond of forest landscape. "Forest and love are for me almost synonymous terms," he wrote. "When I enter a forest . . . I enter a living temple of love, and what pious people call devotion, I experience as longing."³ In his bitterly satirical *Editoren-Kongress*, one of the few beautiful passages is devoted

³ *Editoren-Kongress* (Boston, 1872), p. 322.

to a description of primeval forests. Heinzen disliked the flat, bare prairie country and regarded it as the home of reaction and stagnation in politics. He thought endless expanse of open country, unrelieved by hills and woods, as in Russia, could produce only melancholy and cultural retrogression. He wrote ecstatically about the beauties of Heidelberg and the Rhineland, from whose wooded hills had come so many beautiful songs of joy.⁴ He despised Pittsburgh, being bored by the dark and dirty industrial city, which he described as a spiritual cemetery. But the surrounding Appalachians reminded him of a European landscape, with clear streams and wooded hills. Heinzen did not like the ocean, and one of his poetic fragments, written while he was on shipboard bound for America, ended with, "Das Meer, es bringt nur Langeweile." And, strangely enough, he found neither life nor spirit in Niagara Falls, though he visited the giant cataract several times. It impressed him as "a huge wash-basin" and "a brutal mass of water," not to be compared with the romantic falls in the Rhine near Schaffhausen. For Heinzen, Niagara lost its appeal because the river did not flow through high cliffs, and he insisted that the falls impressed him less than the roaring sea or a lively brook flowing over stones through a forest. He believed that any stream or body of water, in order to be beautiful, must not dominate, but be subsidiary to, the landscape, and that fantasy and poetry flourished best on land.

Heinzen had the good fortune to know a fair number of the interesting people of his time. He subjected his friendships and his enmities to the same rigid tests and standards of "principle" which marked all he did. Even so austere a person occasionally tintured his rationalism with warm and irrepressible human emotions. In spite of a forbidding exterior which he always

⁴ Of Goethe's famous "Über allen Gipfeln," Heinzen wrote: "Wir sehen keine Landschaft, und noch weniger einen Menschen, und doch malt Phantasie und Gefühl sich alles aus, was eine schlafende Landschaft an Eindruck darbieten und was darin ein nach Ruhe, sei es geistliche oder ewige, sich sehrender Mensch empfinden kann." See his lecture on "Der Hintergrund," in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (1867), I, 359.

showed—as a matter of “principle”—to the world outside his little intimate family circle, Heinzen was capable of strong friendships and deep loyalties, which were as much a matter of the heart as of the head; but he made every effort to suppress his feelings, lest they interfere with that cold, critical, rational search for truth which he had resolved must be the aim and purpose of his life. His relations with those with whom he came in most direct contact during a lifetime of agitation and controversy therefore deserve brief analysis, for they throw much light on the character of the man.

Though they had said their last farewells in England in 1851, and Heinzen and Freiligrath never saw each other again, their friendship endured to the end. They had much in common, in spite of Freiligrath's deeply religious nature and early flirtations with the Communists. Heinzen published his friend's poems in the *Pionier* and honored Freiligrath as “an uncompromising republican,” “steadfast and faithful to the cause of freedom.” He was especially pleased when Karl Blind and Freiligrath refused to join the Germans of London in sending a message of sympathy to Queen Victoria at the time of the death of her royal consort. In 1867 the *Pionier* aided in the campaign to raise a Freiligrath fund, which in a year and a half exceeded \$58,000 and helped the poet out of his financial troubles for the first time in his life.

When Freiligrath made his peace with Bismarck and the new Germany, Heinzen was deeply hurt, though his friend's attitude could easily be understood when one recalled that he lost his son in the Franco-German War. The *Pionier* published an editorial on February 6, 1872, on the poet's defection, under the title of “Der Abgefallene,” and Heinzen commented bitterly that his friend's love of liberty had always been “more a matter of sentiment and romance, than of principle and conviction.” Six months later he apologized for this unjust attack. On March 29, 1876, the *Pionier* carried a long article on Freiligrath's death, which ranked him with Herwegh as a true revolutionary

poet and recalled with deep emotion the days of exile in Belgium and Switzerland and the cordial, happy relations of the Heinzens and the Freiligraths in those turbulent years of revolution. Heinzen paid tribute to the dead poet as an honorable, brave man who had been just and conscientious in all things, a devoted husband and father, and a jovial and lovable companion. He concluded that Freiligrath had remained a genuine friend of liberty and had never turned apostate.

Heinzen also had great respect for Georg Herwegh, whom Heinrich Heine once called "the iron lark of freedom" and who was a consistent champion of revolution and republicanism. Heinzen printed his contributions in *Die Opposition*, published in Zurich in 1845, and later in the *New Yorker Schnellpost* and the *Pionier*.

Heinzen undoubtedly owed much of his learning and his philosophy to his early associations with Arnold Ruge. As a young student, Ruge had taken part in the revolutionary excitement in Germany before 1830 and had served five years in prison for his political opinions. He emerged from his confinement to become a teacher at Halle and one of Germany's most prominent Neo-Hegelians. With Professor Eduard Erdmann, he edited the *Hallische Jahrbücher*. Among his collaborators was Ludwig Feuerbach, whose writings Heinzen admired greatly and for whom he helped raise a fund in the United States many years later in order to save the aged philosopher and his family from starvation. At one time or another, Ruge had been associated in various enterprises with Ledru-Rollin, Bakunin, Karl Marx, and Julius Fröbel. He had been elected in 1848 to represent Breslau in the Frankfurt Parliament, and in 1850 he fled to England. Heinzen knew Ruge so intimately during the most important, formative period of his life that some of his critics charged that he got most of his views and principles from him.

Ruge was a frequent contributor to Heinzen's papers in the United States, although the two friends disagreed sharply over religion and equal rights for women. In 1851 Ruge published his

Die Loge des Humanismus, which Heinzen rejected in a series of sharp exchanges with the author as but another feeble attempt to keep religion alive under the label of humanism. In 1852 Heinzen charged Ruge with too great sympathy for the Communists, and the latter retorted that Heinzen's championship of the emancipation of women could only lead to free love. In spite of violent quarrels about religion, materialism, and women's rights; Heinzen's charge that Ruge was a "Hegelian-Prussian patriot," because he believed in the possibility of reforming Prussia without getting rid of its king; and Ruge's reply that the editor of the *Pionier* was an "atheistic fanatic," Heinzen gave his friend full credit for his devotion to liberty and for his fine personal qualities. In 1873, when Ruge was seventy years old and in great financial distress, Heinzen appealed for subscriptions for his collection of poems, and himself contributed \$3.00 to a fund which passed the \$550 mark in three months. In 1877 Ruge accepted an annual pension of 1,000 marks from Bismarck. Heinzen refrained from all comment, though the *Pionier* had reported the death of Hoffman von Fallersleben with the terse comment: "The former democratic and later imperial ballad-singer is dead."⁵

As long as Richard Wagner remained an ardent revolutionist, Heinzen hailed him as "a modern composer of freedom" and tried hard to introduce his music in America. When the composer began to write operas based on librettos drawn from the medieval past and written in "affected, medieval German," Heinzen referred to his former companion in revolution as "Herr Wagner, the Bavarian minstrel." He was so disgusted with Wagner's Nibelungen display at Bayreuth in 1876 that he suggested a partnership with P. T. Barnum.

For Joseph Mazzini, on the other hand, Heinzen always retained a deep respect, not unmixed with genuine friendship. During his exile in Switzerland he had sought the collaboration of

⁵ See *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*, March 28, 1886; and *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1889), XXIX, 594-95.

the great Italian liberal for some of his radical publications. After the Revolution of 1848 the two men had met again in England. On several occasions Mazzini had befriended the Heinzens and helped them to make profitable connections with several English families and later had aided them in raising the money to pay their passage to America. Heinzen was a member of the intimate social group that gathered around Mazzini in London, when the Italian sang to his guitar or whiled away the hours with his friends with games of chess.⁶ Heinzen did not like Mazzini's criticisms of the Socialists, and he was greatly disturbed by Mazzini's frequent references to God, his denunciation of atheism, and his apparent belief that it would be possible to strike at clericalism without attacking religion. Nevertheless, Heinzen regarded the Italian as "a noble character, for whom the unification of Italy as a republic had become a religion."

Many of Heinzen's German associates in revolution preceded or followed him to the United States, and here, unfortunately, the enmities kindled in Germany burst into flame again, and several friendships, subjected to the strain of new controversies in a new land, cooled into indifference, misunderstanding, and even hostility. The number of men whom Heinzen knew well, either here or abroad, and with whom he never quarreled is small indeed.

Wilhelm Weitling, editor of the *Republik der Arbeiter*, and August Willich, of the *Cincinnati Republikaner*, were among the few Communists whom Heinzen respected for their sincerity. Friedrich Hassaurek, who had been a revolutionist in Vienna at the tender age of sixteen and who began a journalistic career in Cincinnati which led to the founding of the *Hochwächter*, "an organ for intellectual enlightenment and social reform," was thoroughly hated by Heinzen, though Hassaurek was an agnostic and an anticlerical, a Free Soiler, and then a Republican. Hassaurek was an excellent orator, as fluent in

⁶ Franz Sigel, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus den Jahren 1848-49* (Mannheim, 1902), p. 146.

English as in German; he was admitted to the bar in 1857; was financially successful; and, later, was appointed minister to Ecuador by President Lincoln. After the Civil War he served as editor of the Cincinnati *Volksblatt*.⁷ Heinzen and Hassaurek became bitter enemies at the time when they edited competing radical newspapers in Cincinnati, and both aspired to leadership of the radical German element in the United States. Heinzen was especially offended when his rival proclaimed his allegiance to the Republican party in 1860 and promptly denounced him as a mere political adventurer, seeking party favors. Ever after, Heinzen referred to his enemy as "Hasendreck."

Judge Bernhard Stallo, another of the luminaries of the Cincinnati Germans, far more conservative than Hassaurek, and certainly no less active in politics, never aroused Heinzen's wrath, and the latter was content to leave their differences of opinion on the high plane of issues rather than reduce them to the level of personal abuse. Heinzen's reactions toward Friedrich Kapp of New York were much the same. During his early years in the United States he had used Kapp's law firm for his legal business, and in 1858 the *Pionier* carried a laudatory review written by Heinzen and his colleague, Douai, of Kapp's *Life of Steuben*. When Kapp chose to return to Germany, after having attained a position of influence and prominence in New York State, and duplicated his success in the Germany of Bismarck, Heinzen refused to give him the title of "citizen of two worlds" and insisted that he had betrayed the liberal principles which had brought him to America in order to become a mere servant of the Kaiser.

Another of the really distinguished German immigrants of the early nineteenth century was Friedrich Münch, a typical "Latin farmer," who was a leader of the immigration to Missouri. There he farmed his broad acres and wrote extensively for American and German papers on religion, ethics, politics, agriculture, and many other subjects and produced a number of

⁷ See *Der Deutsche Pionier* (Cincinnati), XVII, 3-25.

novels and some poetry. Münch had studied theology, and, though too unorthodox to become a minister, he continued to represent Kantian idealism at its best. He had been a contributor to Eichthal's *Schnellpost*, and he continued to write for Heinzen's first papers, under the pen name of "Far West." It was not long, however, before Heinzen and Münch quarreled about their programs of reform. Münch was opposed to the creation of a German political group and strongly objected to Heinzen's plans to change the structure of American federal government. Perhaps more significant was Münch's refusal to accept Heinzen's atheism and his radical abolitionism which called for immediate emancipation. In the *Pionier* of 1857 the two men argued the question of immortality and the purpose of creation at great length. Heinzen's attacks became so personal that Christian Essellen, who did not at all share the views of "Far West" on immortality and materialism, came to Münch's defense in his *Atlantis*.⁸ Essellen and Münch quickly discovered that it was "treason to human reason and a sacrilege to salvation-bringing radicalism" to differ with the editor of the *Pionier* on such fundamental questions.

Of a very different type, but almost equally well known among many German-Americans as a publicist, was the brilliant, warmhearted, but unstable and intemperate Robert Reitzel. Trained for the ministry, though he had the soul of a poet and never outgrew the carousing of his student days, Reitzel came to the United States in 1870 and for some years was the leader or "speaker" of several freethinking German congregations. He was best known, however, for his *Der arme Teufel*, which he published from 1884 to 1898. Heinzen and Reitzel probably became acquainted through their common interest in radicalism. On one occasion, when the former was the guest of honor at a banquet in Washington, Reitzel overwhelmed his friend with compliments and hailed him as the recognized leader

⁸ *Atlantis* (N.S.), VII (August, 1857), 159-60; *ibid.*, VIII (January, 1858), 42-46.

of all the radical forces in America. Shortly thereafter the two men quarreled because Heinzen accused Reitzel of fraternizing with Communists. Nevertheless, Reitzel was one of the speakers at a memorial service after Heinzen's death, and he wrote the following tribute to the dead leader:

Halb gön'n' ich ihn den Grabesfrieden,
Halb wünsch ich, es sei ihm noch beschieden
Die Leiden dieser Zeit zu tragen,
Der Wahrheit gold'nes Wort zu sagen
Und Schuften auf den Kopf zu schlagen.⁹

It is apparent that Heinzen remained on good terms with comparatively few of his fellow-radicals. Samuel Ludvigh and Hermann Kriege were among the exceptions. The former was a German-Hungarian, known as "Fackel-Ludvigh," because he founded many papers with the name "Fackel" in a number of American cities. As a journalist, Ludvigh had Heinzen's unquenchable enthusiasm for radical reform. He began his publishing career in New York in 1839 with the *Wahrheitssucher* and the next year issued the *Wahrheitsverbreiter* in Baltimore. Thereafter, all his papers were known as *Die Fackel*. In them he preached Heinzen's brand of anticlericalism.

Hermann Kriege, a Westphalian, arrived in the United States in 1845 and founded the *Volkstribüne* in New York as an organ of labor and social democracy. Like Heinzen, he was a radical abolitionist and an ardent champion of homestead legislation, and, like Heinzen, he had returned to Germany for the Revolution of 1848 and had been bitterly disappointed by the outcome and especially by the failure of the proletariat to rally to the defense of republicanism. Kriege died in New York in 1850. Heinzen did not feel friendly toward more prominent Germans like Francis Lieber and Hermann von Holst. The former he disliked because he advocated the complete cultural assimilation of the German immigrant and because he was a conservative on all matters, including slavery. With the histo-

⁹ See Adolf Eduard Zucker, *Robert Reitzel* (Philadelphia, 1917).

rian, von Holst, Heinzen exchanged a number of caustic letters, which he published in the *Pionier*. He accused the professor of having come to the United States ostensibly to write a book but really to become a paid Republican stump speaker, and he was even more irritated by von Holst's speeches at German-American victory celebrations to honor Bismarck and the Kaiser in 1871 and promptly denounced him as a man without character.

Heinzen's relations with other "Forty-eighters" throw further light upon his character. With Struve he had been on intimate terms, and the two extremists had issued many a manifesto of republicanism over their joint signatures. They had shared their exile in Switzerland and England, had lived under the same roof, using a common kitchen, and had published their papers in the same print shop in New York. Struve was an unstable but honest dreamer. He experimented with vegetarianism and for a time lectured on phrenology, and his many idiosyncrasies made him an easy victim for Heinzen's pranks and his irrepressible desire to poke fun at even his best friends. The Struve-Heinzen friendship wore thin and finally ended in a complete break for which Heinzen must be held primarily responsible. In his reminiscences he included a long, boring satirical tale, relieved only occasionally by real humor, and dedicated to Struve and his wife, which had no other purpose save to satirize his friend's vegetarianism, his passion for starting newspapers, and his eagerness to address public assemblies. It was a gratuitous piece of ridicule of a man whose intentions were honest and whose motives Heinzen had no reason to doubt.

Heinzen's feud with Friedrich Hecker, which began in Germany during the Revolution of 1848, as already pointed out, was carried on with senseless fury in America. Hecker was an impetuous, high-tempered, impulsive, and irascible person who had manifested these qualities while still a student at Heidelberg. Gustav Körner knew him well in Illinois and was one of his good friends. Körner testified to his honesty, charm, learning, and incorruptibility but also described him as "very fond

of flattery," extremely ambitious, "prone to open his ears to sycophants and parasites," and easily influenced by personal likes and dislikes. Hecker had extraordinary gifts as a conversationalist, considerable wit, and a handsome presence. He loved oratory so much that he frequently lost the thread of his argument in bursts of uncontrollable emotion. "If Hecker had had a little more taste and a good deal more tact," wrote Körner, "he would have been a great writer and speaker." His judgment on public questions was often faulty, and his sense of personal importance developed almost to the point of false pride.¹⁰

Heinzen held Hecker responsible for the libelous tales concerning Heinzen's alleged financial irregularities at Strassburg. Consequently, all that Hecker did or said in America became legitimate game for Heinzen's papers. Hecker was generally accepted in German-American circles as the gallant, romantic hero of 1848; Heinzen lost ground steadily because of his radicalism and his ill-tempered journalism. It did not improve Heinzen's spirits when he contrasted Hecker's relative affluence and growing popularity with his own poverty. By 1856 Hecker had completely identified himself with the new Republican party, and that party was quick to exploit his name and fame among the "Forty-eighters" during the campaign. Heinzen resented such tactics. He was furious to find Hecker, Struve, and Brentano suddenly elevated to a position of apostles of "liberty and equality" among immigrants whose votes the Republicans hoped to garner, and he broke out in new tirades against Brentano, the traitor; Struve, the unstable, impractical dreamer; and Hecker, a "Teutonic Know-Nothing," a former Democrat, a dilettante and bungler of revolution!

Heinzen's relations with Carl Schurz have induced much discussion on the part of the admirers of the two men. Schurz completely ignored Heinzen in his *Reminiscences*, and there is not a single reference to him in Claude M. Fuess's recent biography

¹⁰ *Memoirs of Gustave Koerner, 1809-1896*, ed. Thomas I. McCormack (Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1909), I, 179-80, 529, 531, 545, 584.

of Schurz.¹¹ A careful analysis of Heinzen's attitude toward "the most distinguished of the Forty-eighters" reveals a far more discriminating estimate of Schurz's talents and shortcomings than the friends of Schurz have usually been willing to admit.

Schurz and Heinzen apparently had no personal contacts during the Revolution of 1848. By 1858 the former had become an important leader in the new Republican party, and the following spring Schurz spoke in Faneuil Hall on "True Americanism." This address has always been considered one of his best, and Heinzen agreed with the universally favorable verdict and praised Schurz's remarkable mastery of the English language and his great talents as a public speaker. For some time after others had begun to comment on Schurz's political ambitions Heinzen continued to testify to his fundamental honesty and called upon all liberal Germans to give him their vote for governor of Wisconsin, should he decide to become a candidate.

In November, 1860, the *Pionier* presented a character study of Schurz. Still convinced of his great ability, his cleverness, and the unique position he had won as a German among Americans, Heinzen deplored his loss to the radical cause. He saw Schurz turning into an American politician, eager to "serve" the Americans, instead of seeking to influence them intellectually and culturally, as a German. "The Germans feel that he has become an American; no American feels that he has remained a German." Heinzen believed that the quality of Schurz's German speeches was deteriorating and that the erstwhile revolutionary of 1848 had become conservative and was serving "the Americans by using his fellow-countrymen." The cooling-off process began in earnest when Schurz, in the early days of the Lincoln administration, sided with Seward as an advocate of compromise and moderation.

President Lincoln appointed Schurz his minister to Spain, and Heinzen pointed out that his fellow "Forty-eighter" had been

¹¹ *Carl Schurz, Reformer* (New York, 1932).

handsomely repaid by the Republicans for his campaign speeches to the Germans in 1860. He considered him the ablest and the worst of the office-seekers, though infinitely to be preferred to Hassaureck of Cincinnati, the "beer-hall Demosthenes." Heinzen congratulated Schurz on his opportunity to influence French and Spanish policy from Madrid. In the spring of 1862 Schurz became a brigadier general, and Heinzen commented that he probably knew as much about military affairs as Lincoln knew about Hegelianism. He was disappointed that Schurz should have joined the other Germans in the competition for army commissions, but he gave him credit for devoting a year to the study of military science. He predicted that he would be an honest officer, that he would seek expert advice, and that he would not be an exhibitionist like Hecker. Early in 1863 the *Pionier* urged Schurz's appointment as commander of an army corps. At the disastrous Battle of Chancellorsville he commanded the Eleventh Army Corps, which retreated from the field. Immediately, a large section of the American press began an attack on the "cowardly Dutchmen" who composed "the Foreign Legion." Heinzen valiantly defended Schurz and his men against these charges of cowardice, incompetence, and flight under fire.

When Schurz became editor of the St. Louis *Westliche Post*, Heinzen guessed rightly that he had ambitions to go to Congress. "The prodigal son, the American Schurz, [had returned] to the bosom of the Germans [in St. Louis]." Thereafter, the *Pionier* referred to the "American office-seeker and Bismarckian ante-chamber diplomat." Schurz became a United States senator from Missouri. The *Pionier* gave him full credit for exposing President Grant's plan to annex Santo Domingo and in 1871 lauded his speech in Boston in favor of civil service reform. What irritated Heinzen most was Schurz's audience with Bismarck in 1872. The *Pionier* promptly delivered a furious blast against those who pose as reformers in the United States and "honor crowned bloodhounds" in Europe. Nevertheless, in

1874, when Schurz was invited to Boston to deliver the address at a memorial service for Sumner, Heinzen went to hear him and commented upon the many masterful, beautiful passages in his address. When Schurz became secretary of the interior in the administration of President Hayes, Heinzen was greatly pleased and year after year referred with great satisfaction to the secretary's excellent reports to Congress.

Among Heinzen's closest friends and admirers in the United States were Karl Schmemann, a Detroit businessman to whom reference has already been made; Hermann Lieber of Indianapolis, who was active for many years in distributing Heinzen's publications as president of the Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles (*Verein zur Verbreitung radikaler Prinzipien*); and the younger George Schumm, whom Heinzen, in a sense, accepted as his literary heir, who was called in frequently to help with the *Pionier*, and was given full responsibility for the paper during Heinzen's last illness in 1879. Heinzen left his manuscripts and papers in his care. Schumm was a graduate of Cornell and in later years was associated with Oswald Garrison Villard on the *Nation* and the *New York Evening Post*. Heinzen's name had been a household word in the young man's family. He subscribed for the *Pionier* during the last seven years of its existence, and during the last three years of Heinzen's life the two men were close personal friends. Schumm completely agreed with the master's views on women's rights, religion, and socialism and lectured frequently before *Freie Gemeinde* and *Turnvereine* in various parts of the country. He set the type for some of Heinzen's books, and after Heinzen's death Schumm tried to perpetuate the spirit of the *Pionier* by founding the *Radical Review* in Madison, Wisconsin, in 1881, a periodical issued in the format of the *New York Nation*.

Heinzen's acquaintance with prominent American leaders was surprisingly limited. One reason was the fact that he never completely mastered the English language. His political activities in 1864 brought him into personal contact with John C.

Frémont. He admired radical abolitionists like Thaddeus Stevens from afar, because they were "logical in carrying out their principles." He regarded Ben Wade as "one of the most honest men" and of "complete integrity," and he even swallowed a political adventurer like Benjamin F. Butler of Massachusetts because he was a radical on the question of slavery and reconstruction, and Heinzen continued to regard him as an original, courageous individual. There is no evidence to show that Heinzen and Greeley ever met, though they quoted frequently from each other's newspapers. With Charles Sumner, Heinzen had a number of direct contacts. He liked him from the first because he attacked slavery on moral grounds, and he was greatly impressed by Sumner's culture, giant intellect, high ideals, and incorruptible character. Ralph Waldo Emerson, on the other hand, he regarded as a befuddled thinker, and "as godly as a Catholic priest." Heinzen admired the great agnostic, Robert G. Ingersoll, and the latter called on him at his home in 1878. He described Ingersoll as a generous, jovial, and entertaining person, but, like many others who knew the "Colonel," he was disappointed that his radicalism did not go beyond the boundaries of religion.

In view of Heinzen's constant feud with the theologians, it is interesting to point out that there were at least two members of that profession whom he respected and for whom he felt a measure of affection. One, a certain "Dr. Putnam," who is otherwise unknown to history, was the pastor of a church in Roxbury for nearly half a century. That good man called frequently at Heinzen's home to debate their conflicting views. Heinzen referred to these occasions with real pleasure and testified to his friend's sincerity, his devotion to the social gospel, and his complete tolerance toward freethinkers. The other theologian was Maximilian Oertel, better known as Pater Oertel, publisher and editor of the New York *Katholische Kirchenzeitung*. With him, Heinzen quarreled vigorously for many years but in a spirit of fun and friendly rivalry.

Oertel was a unique figure in German-American literature and journalism. He had received his theological training in Erlangen, Germany, as an "Old Lutheran," and while still a member of that faith he came to New York in 1837, preached in various eastern pulpits, and married Mary Greenfield, of Lyme, Connecticut. In 1840 he was converted to Catholicism, and later he served on the faculty of several Catholic institutions. Oertel was a devout but genial Catholic, a good journalist, something of a rogue whose humor was of a very earthy variety, to say the least, and generally more coarse than subtle. He loved his wine and spent many convivial hours in the taverns with his friends. Much of his writing, even when it was most seriously polemical, was done in verse form. He crossed swords with freethinkers like Heinzen and Hassaureck, with C. F. Walther of the St. Louis *Lutheraner*, and with Dr. Wilhelm Nast, editor of the Methodist *Christliche Apologete*. Heinzen fought back and often in bad taste as far as his reference to some of the most sacred concepts of the church were concerned, but one suspects that the belligerent atheist really liked his Catholic adversary and respected him as a foeman worthy of his steel. When Heinzen moved the *Pionier* from New York to Boston, Oertel said farewell in poetic form:

Es ist uns leid, dass du von hinnen scheidest,
 Dass du New York nun fiehst und meidest,
 Doch lebe wohl und bleib gesund,
 Und treib's in Boston nicht zu bunt.

Heinzen replied in kind, with a poem that ended with the couplet,

Kurz, wie der Stein hält fest am Mörtel
 So bleibt der *Pionier* beim Oertel.¹²

Heinzen's courageous support of women's rights brought him into contact with many of the leaders of the woman's suffrage movement, including Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. An-

¹² See *Pionier*, October 24, 1858; *Die Turn Zeitung*, November 2, 1858; *Memoirs of Gustave Koerner* . . . , I, 550-51; and "Professor Maximilian Oertel," in *Der Deutsche Pionier* (Cincinnati), XV, 58-63, 159-67, 318-29.

thony, who corresponded with him about the progress of equal rights. Intellectual radicals of the opposite sex made a strong appeal to Heinzen, and he derived great satisfaction from their gratitude for his support of their cause. The number of German women who were active in the suffrage movement was small indeed, but Heinzen knew some of them well. He greatly admired Ernestine Rose, nee Polowsky, and took every opportunity to advertise the work she was doing for woman's rights. Born in Poland, the daughter of an orthodox rabbi, she had fled to Berlin at an early age. In 1829 she went to England, became a radical, and married an Englishman named Rose, with whom she sailed for the United States in 1836, where she lectured on woman's rights, abolition, peace, and other causes. Since she accepted practically all of Heinzen's radical program, he exhibited her to his readers as a model for German-American women to follow.¹³

Mathilde Anneke was another of Heinzen's heroines of free-thought and reform. A friend of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Oakes Smith, and Mary L. Booth, a poet and a dramatist of some merit, and the founder of radical women's journals, Mme Anneke was a convert from Catholicism to freethought and, perhaps as a result of her first unhappy marriage, became an ardent advocate of equal rights. In the Revolution of 1848 she had followed her second husband, a former Prussian artillery officer, into the battle lines. In the United States her husband became a journalist and a teacher of physical education, and Mme Anneke¹⁴ lectured widely on woman's suffrage, participated in the early equal rights' conventions, and conducted a distinguished school for girls in Milwaukee

¹³ See Sara A. Underwood, *Heroines of Free Thought* (New York, 1876).

¹⁴ On Mme Anneke see Henriette M. Heinzen, in collaboration with Hertha Anneke Sanne, "Biographical Notes in Commemoration of Fritz Anneke and Mathilde Franziske Anneke" (manuscript vols.; Madison, Wis., 1940), Appendix, pp. 210, 211, 258-59; and A. B. Faust's article in *German-American Annals* (N.S.), XVI, 73-140.

until her death in 1884. Since the early 1850's she and Heinzen had corresponded about feminism, and in 1869 Heinzen had visited her in Milwaukee while on a lecture tour.

Clara Neymann was another of the relatively few German-American women who dared to enter the lists for equal rights. She was the sister-in-law of Mathilde F. Wendt, editor of a woman's weekly known as *Die Neue Zeit*, and an ardent crusader for woman's rights, who in 1872 created a sensation by insisting on registering as a voter in her New York ward. Clara Neymann did not concern herself with serious issues much before 1870, but she made up for her late awakening by touring the country at various times thereafter to make suffrage speeches. An unfriendly critic described her as "very vain" but truly "beautiful." She did not become personally acquainted with Heinzen until 1872, but it is evident that she had worshiped him from afar for some months before their meeting. Heinzen, not impervious to the flattery and adulation of a beautiful crusader in a righteous cause, preserved her letters and occasionally chided her "as a father" for being so formal and worshipful. Her letters sought counsel and support from the sage of Roxbury, and she inclosed manuscripts for his criticism. The lady confessed that she would like to write her mentor in radicalism a "dear, child-like letter," addressing him as "my dear Papa and friend." During an illness she read Heinzen's collected poems and was so overcome with emotion that she could not get beyond the first four pages. She sent her friend detailed accounts of her lecture tours and chided Heinzen for being too "severe" with his criticisms. The two friends exchanged photographs; Heinzen invited her to stay at his home whenever she lectured in Boston, and she reciprocated by inviting him to her home in New York, predicting that Heinzen and her husband would become good friends. In February, 1873, following a visit in Boston, Clara Neymann wrote Heinzen an impassioned letter of thanks and devotion, in which she expressed her desire to sit ever after at his feet, and a month later

she reported to her radical idol that she had slept in the same bed in Sauk City, Wisconsin, that "was once too short for you." Such letters and such friendships are important only in that they reveal a warm human side to Heinzen's nature and a bit of masculine frailty which made him particularly susceptible to the adoration of women admirers. In a world of men, which had steadily denied him the recognition to which his great talents entitled him, Heinzen may be pardoned for seeking satisfaction and praise where he could find them.

Heinzen's closest friend and admirer among the group of radical, intellectual women who recognized in him a fearless champion of the rights of their disfranchised sex was the doctor who shared her household with Heinzen's hard-pressed family and whose devotion to him has already been noted. Perhaps it was asking too much of Heinzen's contemporaries, who had felt the terrible blows of his journalistic bludgeoning, to expect that the long and intimate friendship between the radical editor and the ardent feminist, Dr. Zakrzewska, should escape the notice of the scandalmongers. Not long after the Heinzens had moved into the doctor's home in Roxbury, gossips began to whisper that the two were living together in free love and sin. German-language papers made sly references to Heinzen's dependence on women other than his wife, and some of Heinzen's many antagonists referred meaningfully to Heinzen's strange "family life." But the only specific charge ever made in print appeared in a pamphlet printed by Adolf Douai entitled, *Heinzen, as He Is*. It was the work of a man who had been one of Heinzen's friends and collaborators during the first decade of the latter's publishing activities in the United States. When Douai returned to New York in 1856, from Texas, where he had published a paper, Heinzen made strenuous efforts to find an editorial post for him, and when the *Pionier* was moved to Boston, he made Douai his editorial associate.

In 1860 Douai left Boston to join the editorial staff of the *New York Demokrat*. Heinzen broke with him in the same year

over issues that are not significant here and merely reveal the chronic combativeness of radicals. Douai announced that he would publish a brochure, at ten cents a copy, entitled *Karl Heinzen: Wie er ist*. The *Pionier* published the announcement of the forthcoming exposure of its editor, on December 27, 1860, and when the pamphlet failed to appear on time, Heinzen tried to goad Douai into action by calling him a liar and a "hum-bugger" and daring him to print his charges. The mud-slinging between the *Pionier* and the *Demokrat* continued for a number of years and became noticeably worse when Douai claimed credit for having secured two hundred subscribers for the *Pionier* when that paper was moved to Boston and when Douai became editor of the New York *Arbeiter Union*, a paper which Heinzen regarded as communistic.

The long-promised exposure finally appeared in 1869.¹⁵ The major portion of Douai's pamphlet dealt with difficulties between the two men which dated back to 1853, when Douai was editor of the *San Antonio Zeitung* and Heinzen had accused him of trimming on the slavery question. Much of the trouble arose from shadow-boxing over the meaning of terms. It is only the closing pages of Douai's alleged exposure which are important, for here appeared in cold type what so many of Heinzen's enemies had intimated about his relations with Dr. Zakrzewska. "Our cause," Douai began, "needs morally clean and honorable characters. Whoever would defend woman's rights cannot be himself an adulterer. I do not say that Carl Heinzen is one, because we could not prove that in court." The pamphlet continued: "Among men of honor, even that is adultery when a man, over fifty years of age, makes his faithful wife, who has loyally fulfilled all her obligations to him, boundlessly unhappy on account of a love affair. He who would champion the cause of labor must not live from the support that comes from women (*Schürzen-Stipendien*). Now we do not say that Carl Heinzen does this, for again we could not prove it in court." Douai in-

¹⁵ Adolf Douai, *Heinzen: Wie er ist* (New York, 1869). Pp. 16.

vited attention to the income of the *Pionier*, suggested a study of the receipts from subscriptions, and intimated that the amount would not suffice to pay printing costs, to say nothing of supporting the Heinzen household. He concluded that "the remainder does not come from honest work" and challenged Heinzen to reprint the charges in the *Pionier*.

On November 10, 1869, the *Pionier* reprinted, or adequately summarized, all the important paragraphs of Douai's brochure, interspersed with comments on its factual content. Heinzen took up each accusation in detail and, on the whole, answered them satisfactorily. He marveled that his accuser had stopped short of repeating the old slander that he had "married his own daughter." But it was in replying to the insinuations about adultery that Heinzen surpassed even his usual high standards of invective. He explained where he got the money to launch the *Pionier* and showed that Douai had omitted all reference to funds collected for the paper by agents and to receipts from advertising. Heinzen insisted that the costs of his household were divided among three harmoniously co-operating parties, by which he evidently meant his family of three, the Zakrzewska sisters, and Miss Sprague. Heinzen bought one hundred copies of Douai's pamphlet for ten dollars and made them available to anyone who might be interested. Douai's attack was given wide circulation by papers like the *Illinois Staatszeitung*, the *New York Demokrat*, the *Westliche Post*, and the *Neue Zeit*, but few published Heinzen's refutation. The latter's friends offered to raise a fund to distribute Heinzen's rejoinder, but Heinzen declined their offer and sent them free copies of the *Pionier* instead. The Sandusky *Freie Presse* predicted that Douai's attack would prove to be a boomerang; and Heinzen's friends assembled at a meeting in Turner Hall in Boston to solemnly resolve that Douai was a liar and a slanderer, totally unworthy of respect, and that he had besmirched "honorable and highly respected women." When Douai offered to submit the controversy to a board of arbitration, Heinzen rejected such a "court

of dishonor'' and challenged his adversary to go to law, on the basis of the vigorous counterattacks which appeared in the *Pionier*.

The household arrangements in Dr. Zakrzewska's home were unusual, to say the least, but there is not a particle of tangible evidence to support Douai's insinuations about free love and adultery. Mrs. Heinzen wanted her husband to take the matter to court, but Heinzen, as always, preferred to rely upon free discussion in a completely free press. There is ample evidence to show that Heinzen fully appreciated his wife's loyalty and affection, and he dedicated the second volume of his reminiscences to his wife and son, in gratitude for the sacrifices they had made for him during many years of suffering and hardship. One of Heinzen's last letters, written with the trembling hand of a paralytic, was a moving tribute to the thrift, industry, and self-sacrifice of his wife and chronicled in detail the aid which she had given him at every point in his career. Heinrich Rattermann of Cincinnati, faithful and accurate historian of German-American activities, a contemporary of Heinzen but by no means a fellow-radical, investigated the charges and came to the conclusion that they did not contain a grain of truth.¹⁶ Mrs. Heinzen lived with Dr. Zakrzewska for a short time after her husband's death and then went to live at the home of the Prangs, who were at that time quite well-to-do. She and the doctor remained the closest friends until the latter's death in 1902, and the Heinzen family often visited Dr. Zakrzewska, in her homes in Roxbury and Dorchester and at her summer place in York, Maine. In 1902 the whole Heinzen family attended Dr. Zakrzewska's funeral to pay their last respects to a courageous woman whose devotion to Karl Heinzen and to his family had been great enough to brave the slander of his enemies.¹⁷ When Mrs. Heinzen died the next year, at the age of nearly eighty, the *Boston Germania* and the *Boston Turnzeitung* paid glowing tribute

¹⁶ *Der Deutsche Pionier* (Cincinnati) XIII, 234-44.

¹⁷ See also *Open Court*, XVI, 384, 386-95.

to this "noble, German woman," who was so "universally loved and respected," and who had shown such rare devotion to her husband. She was eulogized as an independent thinker in her own right who, on all points, had been in perfect agreement with Heinzen.

Two other discouraging experiences must have played a large part in building up in Heinzen that sense of frustration and failure which made him such an irascible person. One was the collapse of his ambitions to become a successful and influential lecturer; the other, his failures in the field of literature.

It is fortunate that most of Heinzen's lectures were reprinted in the *Janus* and the *Pionier* and in his collection of *Ausgewählte Vorträge*, for they read well, and they were carefully and thoroughly prepared, after much research and with great attention to style and detail. Heinzen never faced an audience unless he had adequate time to prepare. But as a public speaker he was anything but a conspicuous success. He had a contempt for the tricks of oratory, though he greatly admired a really gifted speaker, like Wendell Phillips. Whether he made a virtue of his shortcomings because he was aware of them, or whether he deliberately wished to force his hearers to give close attention to the substance of his remarks rather than to the manner of their delivery, the fact remains that he was generally criticized for the monotone in which he read his addresses. Many times he remained seated while speaking and made no special effort to make himself heard in a large hall. His command of English was so limited that it deprived him of all opportunity to reach larger American audiences.

Heinzen's first lecture tour was the least successful of all his experiences on the public platform. Financially it was a failure and gained few subscribers for his paper. During the course of this tour in 1852, Heinzen spoke at Columbus, Toledo, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, Louisville, Hermann, Missouri, St. Louis, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York. The editor of the Columbus *Westbote* was deeply offended because Heinzen

remained seated while reading his paper. The Philadelphia *Freie Presse* described his delivery as "cold, with a marked accent, without raising his voice above a conversational tone" and referred to the monotonous quality of his speaking voice. In Cincinnati, Heinzen attacked the Democrats, the Jesuits, and the German newspapermen and provoked a sharp controversy among the German element of the city. In St. Louis he was well received and returned for a second engagement. He had his worst experience in Toledo. His enemies tried to embarrass him at his hotel on the night of his arrival, but a sizable audience turned out to hear him when he spoke in a public park the next day. But the moment he began his criticism of the Democrats, what he described as "whisky-drunken, Democratic German rowdies" broke up the meeting, and he had to repeat his address in a closed hall the next day. Hostile papers, like the *New Yorker Abendzeitung* and the *Demokratisches Tageblatt* of Cincinnati, gleefully spread the news that Heinzen had been chased from the platform after just fifteen minutes. When he canceled engagements in Milwaukee, Buffalo, Detroit, and Boston, his enemies reported that his experience in Toledo was responsible, though Heinzen himself insisted that he was ill. He returned to New York, "richer in enemies and poorer in money" and fortunate to have escaped being tarred and feathered.

These first, unfortunate experiences in 1852 with German-American audiences made a deep and lasting impression on Heinzen and seriously reduced his opportunities as a public lecturer, though they did not altogether end them. In 1856, perhaps in self-justification, he wrote an editorial on "Speakers" in which he maintained that a lecture should be judged solely by its content and that the same standards should be applied to a delivered speech which would be applied to a written one. Heinzen argued that the "inspiration" of a crowd had never been conducive to accuracy and that Cicero, Demosthenes, Mirabeau, and Kossuth wrote as well as they spoke. He criticized platform showmanship, cheap bids for applause, and sloppy im-

provising, for even the best minds could not always have their thoughts ready for immediate expression. Except in a few exceptional cases, he believed it was as dangerous to intrust a great orator with political leadership as it was to give it to a soldier.

In 1856 Heinzen co-operated with Kapp and Dr. Abraham Jakobi in a series of lectures sponsored by the New York *Leseverein*, for an admission charge of two dollars for the series. Fewer than one hundred people attended any lecture. Kapp gave the first three, and the series collapsed after Heinzen's second appearance. The *New York Kriminalzeitung* blamed Heinzen for its failure. Thereafter, Heinzen announced that he would not speak again unless guaranteed an audience of two hundred, but this requirement he was never able to enforce. In the early 1860's Heinzen lectured in the Boston Turner Hall and at Cooper Institute in New York, and Mary L. Booth translated his address on "Public Opinion" for publication in the *Liberator*. It was a curious fact that many of his really important engagements occurred on days when there were heavy rainstorms, which reduced the audiences to a mere handful.

In 1863, after the German Radical Convention in Cleveland, Heinzen went to Detroit to visit his friend Schmieding, a loyal agent of the *Pionier*, to lecture on "Truth" and to go hunting with friends. On the way back he spoke in Toledo, where he had been hooted down eleven years earlier. In 1864 and 1865 he lectured in Newark, Philadelphia, Washington, Cleveland, and Indianapolis, in which latter city he always was assured of a good reception. Here the *Männerchor* serenaded him and gave him twenty-five dollars for propaganda literature—acts of interest and kindness which provoked Heinzen to write:

Wer bloss liebt Wein, Weiber und Gesang,
Der wird kein Mann sein Leben lang.

In the spring of 1869 Heinzen made a three-week tour of the East, where he had better audiences, and he was able to lighten the burdens of the trip with considerable relaxation. He visited

Central Park, in New York, his favorite public park. He went by boat from New York, up the Hudson, to Albany. He loved West Point and the Catskills, and he thought the Hudson more beautiful than the Rhine but was disappointed to find no vineyards on its banks. From Albany he rode to Rochester in a "drawing room" and reached new literary heights in his description of the male sex in the smoking-room of a railroad train, as they sat wrapped in clouds of tobacco smoke and practiced spitting out the window. He proceeded westward to Sandusky, whose large German element gave the town a distinctive atmosphere, and where the *Pionier* had relatively more subscribers than in any other American city. After a successful lecture, Heinzen went on by boat past the islands in Lake Erie to Detroit, stopping at Put-in-Bay to drink wine, which he declared comparable with the best produced in the Rhine country. He was well received in Detroit, but he hated Chicago and did not speak there.

Milwaukee turned out to be a mixture of pleasure and disappointment. It made Heinzen happy to hear children speaking German in the streets; the beer was good, and the town had an excellent German school. But the attendance at his lecture was poor, and the Roman Catholic church was too much in evidence to please an atheist like Heinzen. He saw little to warrant calling Milwaukee the "German Athens" of America. At Sauk City, on the other hand, he was delighted to find a strong band of radicals, great interest in woman's rights, and a flourishing *Freie Gemeinde*. From there he went on to Prairie du Chien, then by boat to Dubuque, and on to Davenport, Iowa, and by rail to St. Louis. In all these centers of German life he lectured to good audiences and was frequently entertained at "collations" after his address. From St. Louis he went by train to Indianapolis in eleven hours. In 1852 he had made the same journey in two days and nights by stagecoach, through swamps and prairies and over corduroy roads. Heinzen commented about the standardized "Main Street" appearance of all middle western

towns but was delighted with the reception he got in them. He compared his happy experiences with the threats of violence which had greeted him in 1852 and, by wishful thinking, concluded that radicalism was on the increase.

In 1875, at the age of sixty-six, Heinzen made his last extensive lecture tour. He spoke in New York and had his audience greatly reduced by bad weather and a Mardi Gras dance held in the hall upstairs; in Detroit, where he had a good audience in spite of a blizzard, thanks largely to the efforts of "Uncle" Schmieding, but where he provoked a storm of his own by twitting his listeners about their bushy German beards and demanding "*tabula rasa*" on their Teutonic faces. Heinzen became such a storm center in the German community in Detroit that there was a violent controversy over the issue as to whether a copy of the *Pionier* should be deposited in the cornerstone of a newly erected hall. Milwaukee impressed him more favorably this time, and in Indianapolis and Utica his experiences were satisfying, and he returned to Boston physically and mentally fatigued but convinced that his frank and unrestrained utterances had produced the proper cerebation on radical topics among his hearers.

Heinzen's literary ambitions were great indeed. He would have liked to be known as a literary genius, but most of his efforts led only to more frustration. The most important source from which his life's story may be reconstructed remains the newspapers which he edited in the United States, especially *Der Pionier*. But he was not satisfied to be known only as a journalist; he wanted recognition as a poet and a playwright and as an author of books, and he announced rather early in his career that he would soon begin publishing his "collected works." He watched with eager concern for the comments of the reviewers, and he listened intently for applause from the public, which never came. His literary efforts provoked little comment. The silence of the reviewers convinced Heinzen that

his inferior and jealous colleagues, and the ultra-conservative public, could not appreciate what he was trying to do.

Heinzen wrote some beautiful lyric poetry. Many of his best poems were inspired by his love for Luise, but in later years it made him angry to have them singled out for praise when his more serious efforts were passed over without notice. His reputation might be greater today had he not resolved to abandon the lyrical form to concentrate on satire, for which he thought he had special talent. His satirical poetry is hardly more than a reform program in bad verse. Whatever merits these poems have as propaganda, they have little to recommend them as poetry, though it must be admitted that Heinzen had a peculiar gift for epigrammatic statement. Four of Heinzen's poems were reprinted in C. Marxhausen's *Deutsch-amerikanischer Dichterwald*, and a number of German-language papers reviewed Heinzen's volume of poems when it appeared in 1856.

Heinzen regarded the *Editoren-Kongress* as the best book he had produced in America. It appeared in Boston in 1872 as the fifth volume of his "collected works." It was essentially the counterblast of a fiery spirit who had been mortally wounded by the brutal and unfair attacks to which he had been exposed in the German press ever since his arrival in the United States. The volume bristled with abusive and challenging sentences. Its plot was insignificant and stupid, and the contents mostly a repetition of what the author had expressed much better in other places.

Heinzen also wrote *Lustspiele*, like *Professor Irrwisch*, *Dr. Nebel*, and several others, and published them in 1870. They were attempts to write satire for the theater and attacked such favorite abuses as censorship, police, and bureaucracy and extolled the virtues of the revolutionary spirit. The comedies could not possibly have been performed on the stage with success. They were practically all dialogue and no action; their comic scenes were raw and primitive, though honest enough, but utterly lacking in taste, dramatic form, and understanding

of the demands of the theater. Heinzen believed that the only proper test to apply to any literary product was whether it revealed correct political principles, which, of course, meant his own. He was convinced that, had his own creations appeared under another author's name, they would have been hailed with loud acclaim.¹⁸

Heinzen's life turned out to be one long record of frustration. He had great ability and indomitable courage, and he prided himself on a sense of humor which enabled him to shake off all disappointments and defeats. Underneath his rough and fierce exterior, however, was an almost tragic need for friendship and appreciation. Heinzen made a virtue of being frank, blunt, uncompromising, and impervious to popular reactions, but there was a very human and even sentimental side to his nature, though few would have guessed it from the gruff, vituperative style of the *Pionier*. His heart yearned for success and approbation. He saw men of lesser ability but more tact and *savoir-faire* go on to places of honor and distinction and be recognized as leaders of the German-American group, while he lost ground steadily save for the small, faithful handful who looked up to him as the inspired and infallible apostle of radicalism. All his life Heinzen struggled with adversity and poverty, and, as he approached the end of his years, he saw his beloved *Pionier* doomed to extinction and wondered how soon he would be forgotten. He was sure that the future belonged to radicalism, and he professed to be content with that assurance; but there is indisputable evidence of his constant yearning for some measure of personal appreciation during his lifetime.

Few people could be neutral on the subject of Heinzen. Men and women either adored or hated him. A few treated him with the contempt of silence. Most people agreed that he was a "virtuoso of invective," a man of rough speech and rough man-

¹⁸ For more detailed discussions of Heinzen's literary activities see Paul Otto Schinnerer, "Karl Heinzen, Reformer, Poet and Literary Critic," in *Jahrbuch der Deutsch-amerikanischen historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois* (Chicago), XV (1915), 84-144.

ners, who lacked even the faintest suggestion of diplomacy and tact. He often attacked most violently those who stood nearest his position, and his enemies suggested that he feared their competition. He "painted with a broom rather than with a brush"; his style was challenging and full of exaggeration; his satire consisted of heaping invective upon invective and insult upon insult. He wrote as though he could command the world from his editor's desk. He never pricked with a needle when he could hit over the head with a hammer. He never learned to please. He was intense and rigid and saw issues too simply. He loved personal polemic. He struck hard blows, and yet he could be genial and generous. He was simple, direct, earnest, energetic, and unselfish. He had the utmost confidence in himself and in his cause. He wanted men to love truth, beauty, and virtue, as he did, and he was not content with piecemeal progress. His passionate belief in human justice made him insist on a complete program of reform, and he wanted to advance on all fronts at once. He was the sworn enemy of all orthodoxy, save his own orthodoxy of radicalism.

There were some who blindly accepted anything and everything "the wise man of Roxbury" and "the master" wrote. To them, the *Pionier* was indispensable. To his critics he was "the pope of radicalism"; to his friends, the "uncompromising Cato." Friend and foe admitted his honesty and his sincerity, his wide knowledge and keen intellect, his great energy, his restless spirit of inquiry. He did not trim, least of all for selfish reasons, and no moral cowardice ever kept him silent on any issue which he thought called for his sledge-hammer blows. He often threw mud at his opponents and became furious when they fired back in kind. If a man smote him on one cheek, he did not turn the other; he hit him hard on both. Heinzen was an incorruptible Jupiter Tonans who hurled his polemic thunderbolts against friends and foes alike. There was a tyranny of opinion about Heinzen, not unaffected by a certain megalomania. He did not see that others could differ with him and be equally honest, and

he never could work as part of an organization, although he talked constantly about the need for organization. Heinzen would have described the religion of his life as "altruistic egoism,"¹⁹ and he thought a man's hates were more important than his loves.

Heinzen believed in the merits of personal combat. He admitted on rare occasions that one should avoid "stupid and coarse personalities," but he never quite succeeded in living up to his resolutions. He believed that no revolution was possible without personal controversy. In the contentions of his day he received blows as vicious as he gave, and there were those who would gladly have carried him to the stake. Yet Wendell Phillips spoke of his "dignity and serenity," and Heinrich Rattermann, who knew him in Cincinnati in the 1850's, described him as "personally a friendly and lovable man."

Die Freiheit war's, die mir den Geist beschwingte,
Die Wahrheit war's, die meine Kraft verjüngte,
Und die Natur hat mich genährt im Stillen.

Heinzen treasured every crumb of honest praise that came his way. He preserved among his papers the letters men and women wrote to commend his work, and he reprinted Charles Dana's account in the *Chicago Republican* of "the redoubtable Karl Heinzen," in which Dana called him "a writer of uncommon spirit, vigor and bitterness" and described him as a man with many admirers but few friends, "with a natural genius for being in the minority" and "thoroughly happy . . . when the minority is composed of one alone." Körner regarded Heinzen as "a man of high intellect and even extensive information" but added that "those who most admired him understood him least." A Cleveland temperance sheet admitted his "commanding talents" and described him as "one of the best logicians of the country." The *Missouri Republican* referred to Heinzen as "a

¹⁹ See an article by George Schumm in the *Alliance* (Chicago), IX (1882), 7-11; see also *Atlantis* (N.S.), III (1855), 65-70, and *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*, August 22, 1886.

man of brilliant mental parts and powers, of much practical wit, of indomitable energy a close observer of men and things , possessed of imperturbable *sang froid*, approaching the homeliest impudence and full of excessive ambition and frustrated plans as stern as Cato, obstinate as Jackson, bitter and uncompromising as Tom Benton." Eduard Schroeter, a fellow-radical, described his friend as a terror to journalists, a rough and edgy person, but a "clean, honorable character."²⁰ Heinzen reprinted all such comments in the *Pionier* as "balsam to a wounded heart."

²⁰ Schroeter to Schmemmann, in *Gedenkbuch: Erinnerung an Karl Heinzen und an die Enthüllungsfeier des Heinzen Denkmals am 12. Juli 1886 in Boston, Massachusetts*, ed. Karl Schmemmann (Milwaukee, 1887), pp. 51-53.

CHAPTER SEVEN

HEINZEN'S PHILOSOPHY OF RADICALISM

WHEN HEINZEN WAS FORTY-TWO YEARS OLD, he wrote to Friedrich Münch, the philosopher-poet-farmer of Missouri: "I was raised in the country, in the thick smoke of Catholic superstition." He went on to describe how, as a mere lad of ten, he had begun to speculate about the nature of God and how, at thirteen, when urged to confess sins which he had not committed, he had revolted against the whole ecclesiastical system. "At thirteen, I was through with God the Son; at seventeen, with God the Father." But there is no evidence to show that he became an avowed atheist, until many years later, and then only because of extensive reading in the fields of science, history, and philosophy.

At whatever age the budding radical may have begun to challenge the teaching of his childhood and the faith of his fathers, his first public avowal of atheism was made in Switzerland during the first period of his exile in that country, and it is fair to assume that Heinzen's whole philosophy of life was deeply influenced by the group of intellectuals he encountered there.

In 1845 a bitter battle between the deists and the atheists broke out among the members of the German colony in Zurich. It had been the established custom of a little band of refugees, freethinkers, journalists, and radical republicans to meet regularly at the home of August Adolf Ludwig Follen, a romantic dreamer who set a good table, with his wife's money, and loved

to entertain the celebrities who came to Zurich. This particular Follen is less well known in America than his brother Karl, who came to Harvard and won notoriety as an early Unitarian and abolitionist; but August Adolf Ludwig had quite a career of his own. He had served in the wars of liberation and had been at the Wartburg Festival of 1817. A knightly crusader for liberty and human rights, he had gone to Switzerland, where poets like Herwegh, Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Gottfried Keller, and Freiligrath; political theorists like the Russian, Bakunin; Julius Fröbel; the journalist, Anastasius Grün; the military writer, Captain Wilhelm Schulz; Wilhelm Weitling, who tried to equate communism with primitive Christianity and published *Das Evangelium eines armen Sünders* in Bern, in 1845; Socialists, Communists, and intellectual radicals of all shades of pink and red were frequent guests at the Follen house. The heroes of this circle of discussionists were Zwingli and Hutten, Washington and Robespierre. Heinzen, along with his friend Arnold Ruge, who arrived in Zurich in 1845, was a member of this brilliant and colorful assembly.¹

Ruge seems to have had the greatest influence upon Heinzen's intellectual development, and there were those who insisted that he gained all his ideas from this Neo-Hegelian. We know that Ruge tried hard to lead his friend through the involved and difficult philosophical terminology of the master, but Heinzen soon abandoned in disgust the effort to read and understand Hegel. Forever after he claimed to have no interest in systematic philosophy, though his writings show an amazing familiarity with most of the important philosophers, from Plato through Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Leibnitz, and Berkeley. Ruge, in his *Two Years in Paris*, attacked the belief in God and immortality, and the two friends discussed these religious questions in Zurich, until Heinzen was moved to publish a series of letters on atheism. Follen, who had been helpful in

¹ See Emil Ermatinger, *Gottfried Keller's Leben* (Stuttgart, 1924), I, 118-20; and Hans Max Kriesi, *Gottfried Kellers politische Lehrjahre* (Frauenfeld, 1917).

getting both Heinzen and Ruge permission to stay in Zurich, was greatly disturbed as he contemplated the public scandal which Heinzen's attack on God and religion would precipitate. Such agnostic fulminations deeply offended his own religious feelings. Heinzen ridiculed his literary colleagues when they disapproved of his ultraradicalism, and in three satirical articles, the last of which was entitled "Feldzug gegen einen teutschem Kaiserpräsidenten," he had exposed the foibles of Follen in a highly personal manner.² Follen published six sonnets in rejoinder to Ruge, Heinzen, and Karl Grün, the future biographer of Feuerbach, and in equally uncomplimentary and personal language attacked the trio as egotists, materialists, and nihilists.³

The war was on. Heinzen and Ruge published violent poetic counterblasts and thereby provoked still another assault directed specifically at Heinzen. Heinzen finally rounded out the war on God in sonnet form with an address to "A. A. L. Follenius, Genie und Kaiser in partibus," and scandalized most of Zurich by his undignified performance.⁴ Heinzen called Follen a "fool" and "a new Falstaff" with "a full stomach and an empty head," and Follen advised Heinzen to stick to the subject of

² *Politische und unpolitische Fahrten und Abenteuer* (Mannheim, 1846), II, 297-322. The other two articles were entitled "Glücksfahrt dreier rheinischer Poeten" and "Ein germanisches Ochsenhorn."

³ "An die gottlosen Nichts-Wüteriche-Fliegendes Blatt an einem Verschollenen" (Heidelberg, 1845); also "Blätter zu dem Lorbeerkrantz eines Verschollenen"; and "Fliegendes Blatt von einem Verschollenen, Zweite auf's Vierfache vermehrte Ausgabe."

⁴ In one of his stanzas Heinzen wrote:

"Du willst ein erst und zweites Leben haben?
Erfüllt ist längst schon dein Begehrt:
Du bist schon vor Dezennien begraben
Und spukest doch noch jetzt umher."

In another he declared:

"Wir haben uns rein auf das Nichts gestellt,
Uns macht nur das Nichts Plaisir!
Wir nehmen bescheiden die ganze Welt—
Das Uebrige gönnen wir dir."

Prussian bureaucracy and leave God and religion alone. The controversy was carried into the newspapers.⁵ Conrad Meyer was shocked by Heinzen's language. Gottfried Keller, the young Swiss poet, became involved in the quarrel, and he also drew Heinzen's literary fire.⁶ The incident is historically important in Heinzen's career and undoubtedly contributed greatly to his difficulties as a refugee in Switzerland, but one must look elsewhere for a more reasoned discussion of his championship of atheism. Follen's and Heinzen's verses were poor, coarse, and scurrilous, and neither party contributed much to the subject under discussion.

The essence of Heinzen's philosophy was materialism. By profession he was an out-and-out materialist, and he refused to accept any philosophy that did not stem from the natural sciences. He rejected transcendentalism and all suggestion of a "creative spirit" with "a will to create." He denied that there could be anything above or beyond what man can grasp with his senses, and he defined "spirit" as the result of natural processes and contended that it could exist only after material changes had occurred to produce it. In other words, spirit, too, rested on the power to experience, understand, and will and, like everything else, went back to man's physiological and nervous systems.⁷ Cabanis' famous statement, "Les nerfs!—voilà tout l'homme," would have been entirely acceptable to Heinzen, for he explained mind and human nature as essentially a functioning of man's nervous system. He revolted against philosophy as metaphysics, though he was tremendously interested in investigating the thinking faculty of man. He completely accepted the materialist methodology. He interpreted psychology physio-

⁵ *Beilage zu Nr. 17 der Neuen Züricher Zeitung*, January 14, 1846.

⁶ See Ermatinger, *op. cit.*, II, 132. It is possible that Heinzen was the prototype for Keller's unadmirable character; Peter Gilgus, in *Grünen Heinrich* (*ibid.*, I, 577). In Keller's "Apotheker von Chamounix" Keller refers to "long Karl," "the theoretical executioner with the peaceful heart," and reserves an ice block for him on Mount Blanc after his death (*ibid.*, III, 157-62).

⁷ See "Der Geist in der Materie," in *Pionier*, April 29, 1854.

logically and maintained that observation is a better instrument than a priori rationalization. And he would undoubtedly have agreed with Jefferson's sensationalistic positivism, as expressed in the latter's well-known letter to Adams in 1820: "When once we quit the basis of sensation, all is in the wind. To talk of *immaterial* things, is to talk of *nothings*. To say that the human soul, angels, God, are immaterial, is to say, they are *nothings*, or that there is no God, no angels, no soul." Jefferson left room in his thinking for a deist's belief in the "Creator"; Heinzen did not.

This concept of man and the universe had, of course, been suggested by many early philosophers, like Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius. It received its greatest stimulus in later centuries from the introduction of experimental science which could be used as a tool to study natural phenomena. Descartes and Francis Bacon emphasized a rationalist mechanism in their revolt against the metaphysics of "spiritualism," and Hobbes applied the materialist philosophy specifically to political theory. It had perhaps its greatest vogue in the French Enlightenment and in the systems of the German materialists of the 1840's and, in more recent times, was incarnated to a degree in a Soviet Russia, based, at least theoretically, on the dialectical materialism of Karl Marx.

This is not the place to discuss in detail all the aspects of the materialist philosophy, but in general it may be said that its advocates wished to substitute materialism for religious cosmogenies and sought to explain the universe by principles and materials familiar to man in his everyday experience. To these philosophers all movements were governed by eternal law. They emphasized the eternity of the world and also the eternity of change in the realm of mind, nature, and society. They denied that there could be a spirit or soul independent of the body; they regarded mind as a function of matter, man as the product of his material environment, and man's "moral sense" as a quality of his nature. Obviously, such a philosophy made its special

appeal to reformers who had faith in what science could do for human welfare and who desired to conquer and harness the forces of nature in the interest of man. Whatever may be said about the attempts of the materialists to break down the intellectual authority of the church, it cannot be denied that they had high social and cultural aims and were eager to discover the specific mechanism of things in order better to control environment in the interest of human progress.⁸

Heinzen's variety of materialism was peculiarly his own and did not fit precisely into the scheme of any of the systematic philosophers, unless it be that of Vogt and Moleschott. He professed contempt for most systematic philosophies. "The history of philosophy," he wrote, "is the history of human error. A microscope or a new chemical element can upset a whole philosophic system that has held men enthralled for a thousand years."⁹

Like all modern scientific evolutionists, Heinzen started his thinking with man the animal. He argued that experience had gradually taught men to gauge the results of their acts and to observe certain laws of action for the future. Mind came out of nature, like everything else, and nature herself became conscious through man and had no meaning except in terms of man become a conscious being. The riddles of nature are our own, and nature study is self-study. Man's highest achievement is to know himself as a part of nature and to seize power and control over it, so that in the end all nature will be transformed and humanized.¹⁰

⁸ For an excellent summary see Sidney Hook, "Materialism," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1939), X, 209-21.

⁹ Heinzen loved to quote Goethe:

"Die Philosophen, gross und klein,
Bauen sich ein Gewebe fein,
Wo sie mit ihren Scheerenspitzen
Gar zierlich in der Mitte sitzen. . . ."

¹⁰ See the lecture, "Ueber das Verhältniss des Menschen zur Natur" (1854), in *Teutscher Radikalismus in Amerika* (Ausgewählte Vorträge, n.p., 1867), p. 246.

Heinzen always insisted that he was neither philosopher nor scientist, though he had read and studied much in both fields. He proposed to write, not as a philosopher who represents a new cult which ordinary people could not grasp, but so that everyone could understand him. It is not necessary to study theology in order to know Christ as a man, he insisted, and it is not necessary to study philosophy in order to understand man and put him at the pinnacle of the whole creation. Heinzen rejected "the absolute idea"—indeed, all "idea"—as a mere "philosophical fantasy." For him nothing existed outside the realm of human apperception, and no idea was possible until nature had evolved a human brain. Man's brain alone was the seat of his spirit and his ideas. He must use it to study and master nature, but nothing existed outside and beyond it. Spirit and matter are the same, and therefore the future of the world lay in the realm of natural science, not philosophy. There is no other purpose behind man's evolution than the *necessity* for evolution which is inherent in matter and nature. Materialistic evolution thus becomes the father of the spirit, not its destroyer, but only in the sense that as a flower has its smell, and music its sounds, so the mind has its thoughts and feelings because of the interaction of certain chemical and physical properties. Heinzen admitted that these properties and forces were not yet completely known to man, but he was confident that they would eventually be discovered.

With what he intended to be a devastating review of human history and scientific advance, Heinzen arrived at the conclusion that he could discover no divine process at work in either history or evolution. History he regarded as the story of the relentless following of effect upon cause and of the unconscious struggle going on among natural forces. In one sense only was he willing to speak of God, namely, in the sense that "God is the world and the world is God," which, for him, amounted to saying that "the world is the world"! Man, like the birds and the flowers, was part of that world, and man's spirit was its highest de-

velopment; but Heinzen left no room for the supernatural at any point in his thinking.

"The world can have no purpose," he maintained, "because it can have no end." All is eternal evolution. He could not think back to the beginning of the universe, and therefore he could not think back to anything that existed before that beginning as a cause. He concluded that the world had existed for all eternity, and in the same breath he admitted he could not form a concept of eternity. Heinzen readily granted that, to satisfy the mind, he would like to envisage an end result for a universe which has been evolving and which will continue to evolve for all time; but, since man's mind or spirit was part of this same process, no one could fathom what it had been earlier or what it would become later on. With this unresolved riddle, man would have to be satisfied. Two years before his death, Heinzen came as near as he ever came to offering a solution of the riddle he had posed, and even then he merely wrote: "If one wishes to speak of a spirit of the world, one cannot think of it as concentrated in any one place, or as diffused through all of Nature, in which only the unconscious elemental forces operate, but only as existing in the countless, thinking beings in countless worlds, on which they originated and are every day created anew, only to die again and be replaced by something new to the end of time. And thus the world has a spiritual and a physical existence, all in one, and has had it forever and will have it through all eternity."

Heinzen believed in a law of progress, as all reformers have to do, but in conformity with nature's eternal laws. He admitted a wide margin of choice for the will, since the possibility of combining the forces of the spirit or mind with the creative forces of nature were practically infinite.¹¹ Thus he left room for a measure of idealism in his materialistic doctrine. But he insisted that his brand of idealism regarded matter and spirit as one and that there was no more antagonism between them than

¹¹ See the lecture "Hat die Welt einen Zweck?" (1857), in *ibid.*, pp. 275-81.

"roses that grow on a rose-bush and belong to it." The world of thought, he argued, consists of what the brain does with sensual experience; but he admitted frankly that the thinking process was still an unsolved riddle, to which he expected to find the answer eventually along scientific, materialistic lines. There is neither "I," "Idea," "God," nor thought outside the human, material brain tissues.

Heinzen's fundamental contention was that materialism is not the enemy of idealism but that the latter must be placed upon a sound, rational basis and be freed from the "spiritualism" of theologians and philosophers. Idealism must rest on a natural, scientific basis of materialism, for then only would it be possible to construct a world of intelligence and ideals adequate to achieve social justice. Heinzen's whole life was proof of the fact that materialism did not exclude a struggle for high ideals and sound morality.

On the subject of immortality, Heinzen concluded that the ever changing and never ending universe was immortal but that no individual person ever could be, and he refused to discuss the future of man in terms of immortality, for he admitted that even this race of men may pass away. Neither world, species, nor idea is immortal, he contended, for everything ends, except nature herself, and even nature lives only by having new forms of life emerge from those that die. Let man accept his fate! Rid the mind of all fantasies about the future and concentrate on the present! The greatest sin, according to Heinzen, was not to live in and for the present. "It will not be difficult to sink into nothingness, if we have been all we could be. We make no demands of the grave, if life has paid its debt to us. The desire to live is commensurate with the power to live, and it will therefore not be difficult to die, in accordance with the law of nature, when life's force is spent."¹² Heinzen argued that atheism helped man to realize his purpose on earth and made him a part of the collective purpose of the world. It forced man to accept sole re-

¹² See the lecture, "Die Zukunft" (1865), in *ibid.*, p. 334.

sponsibility for his progress and rejected the false notion that his freedom and his responsibilities are dependent on the leadership of God.

Heinzen never wearied of the discussion of these questions, so dear to the heart of all agnostics and rationalists. He repeated his arguments many times—in his public lectures and in the *Pionier*. One cannot read the millions of words he wrote on the subject without being greatly impressed by the amazing amount of studying he must have done and by his extraordinary familiarity with all the important philosophers and with the new science of his day. He discussed at length the ideas of Spinoza, Leibnitz, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and many others, and Hegel, “der grösste Phantast,” always stirred his combative nature into action. Heinzen invited contributions to the *Pionier* on all kinds of scientific and philosophical topics and threw open the columns of his paper so generously to them that many of his readers became quite weary of the discussions. When they voiced their complaints, the editor scolded them for their lack of interest in serious and important matters and went right on with articles that ran the whole gamut of human cogitation from discussions of energy, electricity, the soul, and the origins of man and the earth to long passages from Huxley, Virchow, Haeckel, Feuerbach, and others who emphasized the physical bases of life and regarded the world as a sort of chemical, magnetic, electrical laboratory. At the time of the Humboldt celebrations Heinzen seized the opportunity to prepare a special address on the contributions of that great agnostic to human wisdom and welfare.¹³ Heinzen called him “the scientific Columbus of the Western Hemisphere,” the “liberator” of mankind, a magnificent example of what can be achieved by a “thinking, investigating, knowing, grasping intellect.” He described him as one who totally rejected metaphysics, faith, and all extramundane and supernatural influences upon the life of man and who never “de-

¹³ See *The True Character of Humboldt: Oration Delivered at the German Humboldt Festival in Boston* (Indianapolis, 1869).

graded natural science by making her a handmaiden of theology." The New York *Nation* commented that Heinzen had converted his hero into a full-blown atheist "by means of a little Jesuitry."

As already suggested, all materialists opposed every variety of religious cosmogeny. That Heinzen was so violently anticlerical is to be explained not only by his fundamental convictions as an atheist and materialist but also by his fixed belief that all churches, as organized systems, were the allies of conservatism and obstacles to the political and social revolution which he wished to achieve. Just as monarchy had to be exterminated as the enemy of the rights of man, and communism as the foe of man's right to individual self-determination, so the church and all forms of deism had to be eliminated in order that man might realize complete political and personal freedom. Church, monarchy, and communism were Heinzen's three personal devils—the sworn enemies of human progress—and he attacked them all with the zeal of a fanatic.

Heinzen's anticlerical, atheistic writings were so numerous that one might select dozens of examples to illustrate his views. He himself was proudest of his *Six Letters to a Pious Man, with an Introductory Address to a Jesuit, and a Supplementary One to a Humbugger*, published originally in German, and addressed to Bishop Hughes of New York, and then translated and reissued several times by the Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles, which was one of Heinzen's own most cherished creations. Though this little pamphlet is by no means one of Heinzen's best, a brief analysis of its contents will suffice to summarize his views in the field of religious radicalism. The first essay in the collection originally appeared in *Die Opposition* and was republished in Bern in 1848 under the title *Erst reine Luft, dann reinen Boden*.

As the title just quoted suggests, Heinzen would first clear the heavens of their gods before taking up the task of clearing the earth of its monarchs and privileged classes. He protested

his right publicly to proclaim atheism in accordance with the dictates of his conscience and his devotion to truth. "Not faith, but doubt . . . is the divining rod of truth," he wrote. He could not believe in God for the simple reason that such a faith did not square with his reason. He rejected pantheism as a subterfuge which does not dare openly to take the atheist position, and he accepted the word "atheism" simply as a term to negate something which does not exist. To Heinzen it meant essentially the emancipation of man from every form of spiritual and religious bondage. Atheism enabled man to view humanity for the sake of humanity and to seek and build happiness on earth by developing a genuine love for one's fellows. The traditional theological morality thus would be transformed into a human obligation toward one's neighbors and toward the universal rights of humanity, and neither despot nor priest could any longer take refuge in "God's mercy" or "God's will." Heinzen recognized the spirit manifested in humanity, the "self-conscious mind" of man, as the very acme of life and as the basis of freedom and reason. Happiness, with ever expanding knowledge as its chief attribute, is the highest end and aim of life. "The knowledge of the cause of things and of the necessity of their effects is the sum of all wisdom and the foundation of all human satisfaction."

Thus Heinzen bade farewell to all concepts of a personal God. He retained the concept of a universe immortal and forever changing. The soul he equated with thought and feeling; mind he described as "an organized combination and co-operation of physical and physiological powers." Everything that exists is material, and nothing is dead, in the sense that it has ceased to change. "The desire for resurrection after death," he concluded, "must diminish in proportion as men have to fill up and use their lives rationally," that is, "arrange . . . social relations in a thoroughly humane manner."

"That disgraceful worship of human idols, called Majesties," as well as the belief in God, Heinzen found utterly unworthy of man, and completely "depressing and degrading." Human love

he described as "the most beautiful relation of life," and he thought that man's chief task was the achievement of harmony with himself and his fellow-men, in the spirit of truth and freedom. Holding these views as deeply as he did, he did not shrink from pouring all his editorial venom on established and revealed religion, on the papacy, the miracles, the story of Creation, and what he called the humbug of "making something out of nothing." Christianity itself did not escape his violent attacks, though he frequently made it clear that he spoke of it as it was, not as it might be. "Had Christ known how his religion would be misused, he would not have gone to the cross for it," he wrote.

In spite of his occasional kindly references to the courage and devotion of Jesus and to the noble simplicity of his life and original teachings, Heinzen disposed of Christianity once and for all with such sweeping phrases as "the highest grade of humbug, the universal propaganda of nothing." He waxed particularly furious because of its glorification of suffering, privation, humiliation, self-effacement, and sacrifice—qualities which he believed were the essence of Christianity and utterly contrary to the principles of a fighting radicalism intent upon reforming this world by human effort. He also attacked Christianity on the ground that it totally lacked aesthetic appeal. Man's choices were limited, according to Heinzen, to "revolution or resignation." He therefore was especially hostile to a religion which emphasized otherworldliness and substituted the compensations of the next world for the shortcomings of this terrestrial experience. Since Christianity was, in this sense, the enemy of revolution, he did not hesitate to describe Christ as the God of reaction. Instead of accepting Jesus as the savior of the world, he thought it was necessary to free man from the whole Christian concept of salvation, by means of the use of reason, radical heathenism, and atheism, fortified by modern science and unflinching devotion to truth, for, unless the gods were dethroned and the churches closed, reason could not rise in their stead!

Heinzen's opposition to all existing, organized churches and religions was so fundamental to his whole revolutionary radicalism that he seldom could give expression to it except in violent language. His watchful eye pounced upon the manifestations of clericalism wherever he found them. He exposed clerical domination in Canada, with its Lord's Day statutes; he rejected Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* because one of its heroes was a benevolent Catholic bishop; and he fumed against the laying of the cornerstone of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York and wondered how much money one could raise in that wealthy metropolis for a temple of reason. He denounced the priesthood in the most unmeasured terms and delighted to recount salacious tales of their hypocrisy and misconduct.¹⁴ He referred to the communion service in terms so disrespectful as to shock even some of the freethinkers. He attacked the papacy and its miracles, its "sacred bones," and its saints. He reprinted tales of nunneries and Jesuit machinations; he ridiculed the confessional; he contrasted the despotic hierarchy of the church with the simple principles of Jesus; and he denounced American politicians who courted the influence of the Roman Catholic church. He was especially insistent that the American republic protect itself against the intrigues of Rome, and he denounced, as treason, the concept that a man's first allegiance could be to God or a foreign hierarchy rather than to his country. He had not one good word for the pope until the latter, in the 1870's, locked horns with Bismarck and Hohenzollern Germany in the famous Kulturkampf.

Although his heaviest guns were trained on Catholicism, let no one suppose that Heinzen spared the Protestants. He referred to certain Protestant church papers as worse than Catholic organs in their dissemination of nonsense and superstition. He was especially hostile to the publication of the German Methodists, known as the *Christliche Apologete*, and called it the

¹⁴ See *Der deutsche Editoren-Kongress zu Cincinnati, oder das gebrochene Herz* (Boston, 1872), p. 355.

"organ of the higher idiocy." The Henry Ward Beecher affair of the 1870's gave him new ammunition for his attack on clerical hypocrisy, and he referred to that eminent preacher as one who gave the wife of his friend "private lessons in Christian love." He found it impossible to distinguish between "Protestant hypocrisy and Catholic Jesuitism," and he called the Y.M.C.A. the *ecclesia militans* and the Jesuits of Protestantism.¹⁵ Nevertheless, he was forced to admit that in one respect all American ministers of the gospel were an improvement over their European colleagues in that they had the courage and the integrity to discuss daily problems of politics from their pulpits.

Enough has been said to make it abundantly clear that Heinzen wished to destroy all religions, because they were grounded on faith and authority and therefore were the enemies of freedom. "Every religion," he wrote, "begins with love and ends at the stake; begins with altruism and ends with exploitation; begins with sacrifice and ends with persecution; begins with enlightenment and ends with eclipse; begins with freedom and ends with tyranny." For all this he would substitute a radicalism based on limitless, free inquiry. For him the fight against despotism and reaction and the fight against religious obscurantism and clericalism were synonymous. It would be impossible to make political progress and at the same time stand still in matters of religion. And he was particularly insistent that the term "religion" be not misused to mean simply morality, humanitarianism, and idealism.

Heinzen was not satisfied with the American formula for separation of church and state. He believed that a church could not really be "separated" from the state and therefore should be completely cut off and neutralized. "Religion," he wrote, "is a matter of individual conviction or of individual belief." It must therefore be left entirely to the individual, and the state has as little right to encourage it, or to examine a man's reli-

¹⁵ See the lecture, "Ueber die unfreien Männer" (St. Louis, 1852), in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (Boston, 1871,) II, 104; cf. *Pionier*, November 4, 1874.

gious convictions, as it has to concern itself with any of his other views. The state must be an "atheist" state, in the sense that it would destroy every church but tolerate every man's religion. Let the people form associations to hire their own religious teachers, Heinzen said repeatedly, and let them build their churches as they would build theaters or music halls; but the state must neither hinder, prohibit, demand, dictate, influence, nor encourage any religion, denomination, or faith. In short, the state should neither "have any religion nor recognize it," for the state deals only with men, not gods; with knowledge and not belief; with concrete interests and not with fantasy or speculation; with the education of men and citizens, not with producing believers.

This line of argument logically led to a denunciation of legal oaths, Sunday laws, the opening of legislatures with prayer, the proclamation of religious holidays, like Christmas and Thanksgiving, by governors and presidents, and the exemption of church property from taxation. Heinzen would have denied the church the right to hold corporate property at all. He concluded that in the United States separation of church and state was merely a convenient formula to emancipate the hierarchy from the control and restrictions of the state and to give the church special recognition in the everyday life of the people. "Separate" religion from the state, Heinzen argued, but "annihilate" the "church," a state within the state and, in one important case at least, subject to a foreign potentate besides. He dissociated church from religion, doctrine, or belief and defined it as "the organized power of the priests to use the belief for the enslavement of the believers, for the plunder of the people." As the despot plunders through force, he contended, so the church accomplishes the same end through faith, and thus the alliance between altar and throne becomes natural enough.¹⁶

Such views were not original with Heinzen, though some of

¹⁶ See *Separation of State and Church* (Indianapolis, 1882); *Janus*, April 13, 1852; *Pioneer*, April 8, 1855, and August 2, 1860.

his methods of expressing them were. It should be recalled that, in the period from 1825 to 1850 alone, there were at least twenty papers published in the United States for the purpose of destroying Christianity and the "superstition" of the churches. Of the ten freethought papers printed in the German language, the most important were Heinrich Koch's *Antipfaff* (St. Louis), Eduard Mühl's *Lichtfreund* (Cincinnati), L. A. Wollenweber's *Der Freisinnige* (Philadelphia), and Samuel Gottlieb Ludvigh's *Die Fackel*. The *Boston Investigator*, edited by Abner Kneeland, Massachusetts carpenter and former preacher, and the *Beacon*, edited by the Englishman, Gilbert Vale, lived for more than ten years.¹⁷

Other foci of freethinking radicalism were the *Freie Gemeinde* and the *Freimännervereine*, which were established in the United States by the "Forty-eighters." These independent congregations and organizations broke away entirely from organized religion, rejected the ritual and dogma of the churches, and tried to reconcile science with morality and religion. Their principles varied all the way from unadulterated atheism to what today might be called Unitarianism, Universalism, liberal Congregationalism, or the broad, nonsectarian features of a modern community church. The extremists dismissed all religion as a figment of the imagination and worshiped at the shrine of materialism and science.¹⁸

The *Pionier* made frequent references to the activities of these freethinking societies, but Heinzen could never give them his unqualified indorsement. He criticized them for their lack of interest in politics and social issues and for their indifference to such questions as revolution, slavery, and democracy. He warned that emancipation from heaven alone was not enough and urged them to enlarge their social vision, lest they become

¹⁷ See Albert Post, *Popular Freethought in America, 1825-1850* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943).

¹⁸ See Carl Wittke, *We Who Built America: The Saga of the Immigrant* (New York, 1939), pp. 222-25; Benno von Wiese, *Politische Dichtung Deutschlands* (Berlin, 1931), p. 80.

merely another church in a new form. "Mere hatred of preachers," he wrote, is not enough. Radicalism must be applied to all of life. Heinzen admitted that religion would be an important factor in human affairs for a long time to come, but he believed that eventually man, fully developed in all his capacities, would be able to do without it and would no longer lean upon it as a solace and a refuge because of his lack of knowledge and understanding. The age of Christianity he regarded as a mere transition stage, just as monarchy was merely a transition to revolution and democracy.

Having disposed of God, religion, and its priests in Olympian blasts of furious denunciation, Heinzen, like so many other atheists and agnostics, proceeded to forge a code of morality and conduct which approximated, in practical merit, the principles of the church which he had assailed. To this stern code he adhered strictly and rigidly, with quite as much devotion as those who derived their inspiration to lead the good life from some supernatural authority. It is in the analysis of this more positive side of his philosophy of life that one finds the key to Heinzen's unwavering struggle for human rights.

Heinzen was able to conceive an independent, sovereign humanity, freed by rationalism from all superhuman guidance and authority, and able, by utilizing its own resources, to climb to ever higher states of culture, as manifested in art and science, in political and social institutions. "The coarse atheist, ranting in the beer-house against religion," he remarked in one of his best-known lectures, "and believing that in this cheap way he is initiated into true human society," is as bad as the religious fanatic with his prayer book and miracles.¹⁹ Heinzen despised those who cared only for material gain and pleasure, and his whole life was a demonstration of his sincerity in this regard. To him, life was a severe, exacting discipline in self-education.

Heinzen believed in equal rights for all, recognized all the implications of the common nature of all men, and insisted upon

¹⁹ *What Is Humanity* (Indianapolis, 1877). Pp. 30.

the fullest respect for the rights of others. In the universal right of all to enjoy freedom, prosperity, and educational opportunities, he, of course, included women.

The distinction between right and wrong depended, according to Heinzen, on the development of intelligence to the point where one could choose between right and wrong, by exercising free will and a deep sense of responsibility. "Understanding is free will and responsibility." He envisaged "a rational harmony in a nobler society" and dreamed of a utopia in which wars would cease and universal law would govern the world. He refused to become a misanthrope, a recluse, or an egotist and deliberately cultivated a sense of humor to help him in his battle for truth and reform.

Heinzen proclaimed the search for truth and justice, and their practice in daily conduct, as the highest purpose of man.²⁰ "Truth is its own end, but it has value only in relation to mankind," and he defined it as the result of knowledge and understanding (science), creative force (art), and human relationships (morality). The desire to know seemed to him to be a universal trait, and he was not discouraged because the whole truth could not always be easily discovered. The important consideration was to induce men to use, faithfully and loyally, as much truth as they had. He warned against the tendency of the philosophers to remove the theological garment of "God" only to bring him back under the guise of the "Idea," and he insisted that the true world could not be found in the "idea" of Plato or Hegel or Berkeley but only in nature and in material things. The world, therefore, was not an illusion but something which man could know and which he alone, in all creation, could judge. "There is a truth," he wrote, and "Nature is its source, and man its measure. . . . What man recognizes as truth, is truth, not only here, but in the whole universe." Without the stimuli emanating from the natural world, there could be no thinking about truth at all.

Heinzen agreed that from the moment man acquired con-

²⁰ *Das Prinzip* (7 pp.), issued by the *Freie Gemeinde* of Milwaukee.

sciousness and reason, and a desire to strive, he also acquired the capacity to make mistakes. But, since error was the result of choice and an attribute of freedom, it might, in the long run, serve as the *provocateur* of truth, as long as all men were left free to combat it.²¹ Freedom was the essential prerequisite of the never ending struggle for the ideal of justice, and justice was truth made real. Freedom, Heinzen pointed out, is "the capacity of the intelligence and the will to fully understand the law of reason and to realize it in the striving for the ideal of human progress." If all men were reasonable, obviously there could be no tyranny. Freedom with Heinzen was an ever expanding ideal. To achieve it, men must be educated for freedom and become "aristocrats" in spirit, and their passions and emotions must be ennobled by reason and beauty, by respect for others, and by a recognition of the intrinsic worth of all men.²²

Happiness was the end of life, but Heinzen defined it in terms of high ethical and moral standards. He believed no man could be happy for himself alone. Indeed, there could be no genuine happiness as long as others were unhappy or unfortunate, for the interest and welfare of one must be the interest and welfare of all. "That all or none shall be happy" he regarded as one of the principles of the law of nature. He realized also that to achieve universal happiness, the one fundamental desire which unites all mankind, there must be an end to all rule by force; and men must have security, be educated, and be guaranteed a means of livelihood. Heinzen wanted much of life, and he wanted to live it abundantly. He saw no virtue in the renunciation of worldly values, and he thought that life in America tended to blunt man's capacity for joy and sorrow. But he made it very plain that happiness was not simply a matter of the senses but rather a matter of intellect and consciousness and that the degree to which man attained it depended upon the degree of

²¹ "Die Wahrheit," in *Teutscher Radikalismus*, II, 222-37.

²² See the lecture, "Ueber 'freie Männer'" (New York, 1852), in *Teutscher Radikalismus* and reprinted in *Libertas*, May 19, 1881.

culture which he could develop. Heinzen always was concerned with ways and means of providing for the ordinary wants and needs of the people, for without physical contentment he believed happiness was impossible. But, for himself, happiness depended essentially on the attainment of a high state of culture and freedom. Like all materialists, he emphasized environment. Given "equal, corresponding conditions," he concluded, "all men are relatively and equally happy."

Heinzen's doctrine of happiness emphasized the need for service to others. "The most beautiful and sublime egotism of noble men," he wrote, "from Socrates to Rousseau, from Christ to Robespierre, has ever consisted in the fact that they labored for the happiness of common humanity because its misery was to them intolerable." Heinzen rejected sentimentalism and what he considered hypocritical reasons for sacrifice. He wanted men to be philanthropic because of their intellect as well as their feeling, because of their personal self-interest as well as their devotion and sympathy for others. He warned the benefactors of mankind not to be "discouraged by the stupidity of the common people, who are always the most hostile toward those who seek to cherish them," and he readily admitted that the sorrows of the people have been heavy enough to justify their doubts about the ability to improve their lot. Above all, however, he counseled against cynical surrender and the notion that "all is vanity," just because all things end eventually. "To live in and for others," he wrote, "is to double one's own life, and the greatest art of all." "Enjoy life without fear and with moderation in everything, and do no harm to others is a simple recipe for a happy life and a happy death." Asceticism Heinzen left to weaklings.

In spite of Heinzen's constant insistence on the fullest realization of the ego, there was much altruism in his code of conduct. He advised the exercise of the will by practicing deliberate self-restraint even in moments of greatest happiness and cautioned against intemperance in any form. "Do not believe in

complete happiness," he continued, "but also do not believe in complete misfortune." Retain faith in humanity, and what you are disappointed not to find in others cultivate all the more in yourself. Preserve your self-respect and before blaming misfortune on others probe deeply to be sure the fault is not your own. Live in harmony with the laws of nature and never compromise with truth or liberty. These were some of the tenets of Heinzen's radical creed.

Morality Heinzen based on free self-determination and self-control, springing from the honor and reason of mankind. He regarded as "bad" that which offends against the rights of others, and he defined the "worst people" as those who deny their fellows the rights of man and the opportunity for happiness and who use them for their selfish purposes, by robbing them either of their liberties or of their means of subsistence. Love of man he based on the rights of man, for "one cannot be a friend with one who is one's servant." Conscience he defined as the sense of opposition which arises in a moral man when he sins against reason and the intrinsic worth of his fellows or against the rights of mankind. Decency he considered an aesthetic question, an attribute of beauty. "Ethics and aesthetics are sisters. Educate man to be beautiful, and you have educated him to morality." He believed all men were conscious of a sense of wrongdoing and that religion was unnecessary to sustain it. He also refused to set any limit to the capacity of man to progress. "Greater and more powerful than a Zeus," he wrote, "man will some day dominate this earth and be able to say, this Nature, which I once revered as a humble believer, now lies at my feet, transformed into my handiwork, by my spirit and my labor. I found it a raw mass, a shelter for beasts, not men; I have transformed it into a Paradise, and what I created is mine."²³

Heinzen believed that those who accepted the tenets of his brand of radicalism were especially obligated to observe a stern moral code. He rejected, as the morality of despotism, the prin-

²³ *Teutscher Radikalismus*, I, 259-60.

ciple that the end justified the means. He admitted that some radicals have neither principle nor honor and are no better than "popes and despots." For himself, and for all who accepted his leadership, he made the highest sense of honor the guide and control of life. No one wrote more forcefully against all forms of vice and self-indulgence or denounced the disintegrating perils of sensuous pleasures in more scathing language. Heinzen practiced what he preached, not only to the point of moderation in all things, but even to abstemiousness. He disciplined his will and his powers of self-control—except for the immoderate tone of his journalistic controversies—as a special obligation to the radical creed which he professed. He wanted radicalism to be something positive, a way of life, not a mere denunciation of opposite points of view; and in noble appraisals of the potentialities of mankind he pictured a "new Hellenism" of justice, truth, and beauty.²⁴ He well knew that progress was slow and difficult. In one of his moments of deep depression he wrote: "It is a terrible task to write the truth with one's very heart blood for a whole lifetime in the sand of the desert, and to try to kindle decaying straw into the flame of the spirit. . . . He who no longer hopes, will no longer be betrayed, and the art of despairing at the right time is nothing more than recognizing at the right moment that one never should have had faith in the first place." But such sentiments were not typical of Heinzen. Though he had every reason to become discouraged and to be disappointed by the apathy of the German immigration which he tried to lead, he remained the irrepressible crusader to the end.

²⁴ See "Zur Moral des Radikalismus" (1856), in *Teutscher Radikalismus*.

CHAPTER EIGHT

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR THE NEGRO

AMONG THE SO-CALLED "FORTY-EIGHTERS" there were many reformers and revolutionists who wanted to rebuild the world according to their hearts' desires and who were eager to begin by reforming America. That they were disappointed with some of the features of American civilization and that their first impressions did not measure up to all their hopes for this land of freedom and equality was to be expected. For several years, from 1849 to 1854 especially, they were homesick for the fatherland which they had left behind, and many German immigrants, who later became distinguished and enthusiastic Americans, during the first half-dozen years of their sojourn in the United States lived only for the happy moment when they might return to their native soil.

To find human slavery firmly entrenched in the American constitutional system, condoned by the major parties and the best people, blessed by the "Democratic" party of Thomas Jefferson, and defended in the public press and from the pulpit represented an inconsistency between theory and practice which no true radical could accept. It is true that many erstwhile German radicals and liberals eventually lost their passion for reform as they became absorbed in making a prosperous living and in acquiring influence and property. These men quickly settled down to a complacent acceptance of the status quo and the practical compromises of party politics. They continued to vote the old

party tickets, especially the Democratic, even after that party definitely passed under the domination of its southern slaveholding wing.

Heinzen was not a compromiser. It did not take him long to discover the shortcomings of American "democracy." He began his discussion of the iniquities of slavery early in 1851. He repudiated all notions of the Negro's racial inferiority; he denounced the African slave trade; and he recounted every weird tale of white atrocities against the colored man which he could find. He belabored the churches for their hypocrisy in trying to lure the black man into the fold of the "religion of love" and at the same time of condoning the daily practice of treating him like an animal. Heinzen's papers featured "Southern chivalry," the slave traffic and the slave system, exposed the "rotten borough" system of the southern states, and denounced the Democratic party for its acceptance of human slavery. Within a few months of his arrival in the United States, Heinzen was completely identified with the radical abolitionists and demanded complete equality for the Negro.

In 1852 the *Janus* announced Heinzen's platform, as far as the Negro question was concerned. He rejected the Compromise of 1850 and every proposal to regard it as a "final" solution of the slavery question. He exposed the inhumanity of the Fugitive Slave Law, by publishing *Menschenjagdbülletine* in practically every issue of his paper. He denounced slavery in a public lecture in Cincinnati in 1852. He noted eagerly every new sign of abolitionism, such as the founding of the *Neu England Zeitung* or the holding of abolitionist conventions in various northern cities, and he was convinced that "opposition to the politics of slavery in America is a battle against reaction in Europe. This republic cannot and will not be able to do anything for European freedom until it has shaken the yoke of slavery from its own neck."

Heinzen was confident of the early disintegration of the Whig party. Because of their affiliation with southern slavocracy, he

could not support the Democrats, and so he offered his support to the Free Soil party and placed the name of its presidential candidate at the masthead of the *Janus*. He appealed to German workingmen and Turner to rally to the banner of the new party of "free democracy," liberty, progress, and antislavery principles. Few German papers followed the lead of the *Janus* and the *Neu England Zeitung*. Influential papers, like the St. Louis *Anzeiger des Westens* and the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* frowned upon the new party and accused Heinzen of selling out to the Whigs. The few papers that supported Heinzen's position had little circulation, but among them were the Hermann, Missouri, *Wochenblatt*, the St. Charles *Demokrat*, the *Davenport Demokrat*, and the *Deutsch-Amerikaner*, a paper established not long before in New York by Konrad Krez. Heinzen interpreted the election of Pierce in 1852 as a victory for reaction and the slaveholders and predicted a new alignment in American politics in the next campaign.

Perhaps it was unfortunate that Heinzen became involved in a major American political battle so soon after his arrival in the United States. The German-language press heaped abuse upon the radical newcomer who had the temerity to plunge so recklessly into a campaign about which he could be only imperfectly informed. The fact remains that Heinzen's discussions of the Baltimore convention, which nominated Franklin Pierce, and of the Whig convention, which selected Winfield Scott, showed an extraordinary grasp of American politics for one who had been here so short a time.¹

The dark clouds of the slavery controversy settled rapidly over the land after 1852. Stephen A. Douglas reopened the sec-

¹ Heinzen, in his reminiscences, reported that Arthur Tappan, prominent dry-goods merchant and silk importer in New York, philanthropist and donor to the abolitionist cause and to Oberlin College, once offered him financial support for his paper, but when he discovered that the editor was not a Christian, he withdrew his offer on the ground that no one who was not a follower of Christ could be a genuine abolitionist (*Erlebtes*, Part II: *Nach meiner Exilierung* [Boston, 1874], II, 456).

tional battle with his famous Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854, and this incident was followed by an unbroken chain of events—"bleeding Kansas," the Dred Scott decision, John Brown's raid, and the triumph of the "Black Republicans" in 1860, leading directly to secession and civil war. Heinzen denounced "popular sovereignty" as high treason and referred to its sponsor as "Douglas Iscariot." He welcomed the formation of the new Republican party and eagerly reported meetings of German Republicans held throughout the country in 1856 as the first manifestations of German group action of which he need not be ashamed. He refused, however, to become a member of any party committee because he had not yet completed his naturalization and because he wished to safeguard his independence. In August, 1856, he advised the Germans to arm and to drill and urged them to vote Republican as the best way to defeat Buchanan and to make the party more radical. Heinzen wrote laudatory editorials about the Republican platform of 1856 and singled out, for special commendation, the plank denouncing polygamy, on the ground that it struck a blow against the slavery of women. Heinzen predicted Frémont's election. When Buchanan won instead, he attributed his victory to Republican overconfidence. But he was certain that the United States faced an "irrepressible conflict," and he wanted the issue joined as soon as possible. He became more violent against the Fugitive Slave Law and more enthusiastic about the Negro's potentialities; he denounced Buchanan as the enemy of workingmen; and when the Supreme Court, "the Holy Sec of slavocracy," handed down the Dred Scott decision, Heinzen hailed it as certain to lead to the "dissolution of the Union, the revision of the Constitution, and the extermination of slavery." Heinzen's feuds with German editors who berated the abolitionists grew more heated with each passing month. The Baltimore *Turnzeitung*, the *Wecker*, and the New Orleans *Louisiana Staatszeitung* attacked him for his radical views, and he, in turn, was bitterly disappointed by the apathy of his fellow German-

Americans, who were more interested in beer-halls and singing societies than in humanitarian reforms. "One wants to rule the world as a Turner," he wrote, "another as a Worker, another as a Singer," but they never unite as "free human beings" to work for the general welfare.

In the fall of 1859 the country was stirred from end to end by John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry. Though Heinzen admitted that Brown's plans for a Negro insurrection were utterly impractical, he hailed him as a hero. "Hang him, if you dare," he shouted on November 5, 1859. "The rope will be around your neck." Brown went to the gallows and became a martyr to freedom. "There he hangs," wrote Heinzen, "and will hang, until revenged. The Mason and Dixon line no longer divides the nation. A gallows now separates North from South. That gallows will be the signpost for the politics of this land. It will move down toward South Carolina, or up to Massachusetts." Heinzen thought a new "American Revolution" was inevitable. He wanted its headquarters to be in New England, and he proposed a "John Brown Association" to prepare Americans for the appeal to the sword. He pictured Brown as the martyr, murdered "in the name of the Republic and the law," and all Virginia as his executioners. He described Brown's last hours, stressing every harrowing detail, his last meeting with his wife, his many farewells, the gruesome hanging, and the martyr's refusal to see a priest before ascending the scaffold. Ever after, as far as Heinzen was concerned, Brown was the "pride and disgrace of this Republic, its most courageous martyr and hero in the cause of liberty."

The *New York Evening Post* immediately branded Heinzen as a "red republican" and a "fanatic." The majority of the German-language press used more violent language, but the editor of the *Pionier* remained unshaken in his devotion to abolitionism. On December 3, 1860, he started for Tremont Temple, in Boston, to attend an abolitionist gathering to honor the memory of John Brown. It was the first time he had ever set foot in-

side a house of worship in America and therefore the greatest concession he could make to the cause. With him went some of his Turner friends, for there had been threats to break up the meeting. They found the doors of the temple locked, a mob milling around it, and the meeting transferred to a Negro church. The mob followed to the new location, where the memorial services were held, with Wendell Phillips, Mrs. Marie Child, a prominent abolitionist, Frederick Douglass, Frank Sanborn, and a son of John Brown on the platform. Heinzen was particularly pleased to see a number of Negro women in the audience. Noisy demonstrations outside the church made it difficult for Phillips to be heard, and he had to be escorted to his home through a side street. Heinzen could not say enough in denunciation of Boston, "the cradle of liberty," a "Republican city" with a "Republican mayor," who had forced liberty to seek refuge in a Negro church, where former slaves became its protectors. He might have added a word of commendation for the sturdy German Turner who helped keep out the mob. It was a service to the cause which Wendell Phillips never forgot.

Heinzen consistently refused to consider any argument against slavery, whether political, social, or economic, save the purely human one that it was wrong for one man to hold another in bondage. When Seward began to retreat from the position he had taken in his "irrepressible conflict" speech, Heinzen commented: "Seward stopped being a Republican when he saw the White House." For a time the *Pionier* stood ready to sponsor a liberty party, with Owen Brown, son of the martyr, as its presidential candidate. Heinzen disliked the "stereotyped repetitions" of political campaigns and was disgusted with the Republican platform of 1860 because it avoided the issue of abolition and failed to denounce the Fugitive Slave Law. The party "attacks slavery where it does not exist, and protects it where it does exist," he wrote. When Carl Schurz tried to rally the German vote for Lincoln, Heinzen promptly read him out of the ranks of radicalism as a "mere American politician."

He was particularly incensed because the Republicans had indirectly repudiated John Brown in order to conciliate the conservatives, and he refused to accept the platform's "Dutch plank," inserted under pressure from the German delegates to the convention to counteract the discriminatory Massachusetts "two-year amendment,"² as anything more than a mere "plaster on the wounds of the immigrants." By 1860 Heinzen wanted another new party, pledged to the extinction of slavery everywhere, on the basis of the natural rights of man as embodied in the Declaration of Independence. He remained a "republican" but was no longer "a Republican."

The *Pionier* followed the campaign of 1860 with keen interest, certain that a crisis was at hand and hopeful that it would inaugurate a genuine revolution which would not only abolish slavery but also include a program of radical reform in the political, economic, and social life of the nation. Heinzen thought Garrison's *Liberator* had far too narrow an objective. He was eager to get the Democrats out of office, but he expected no idealism from the new regime. He announced Lincoln's election in a few inches of regular type and felt certain that the new president would appoint slaveholders to his cabinet and accept compromises when once in office.

Heinzen watched with tense feeling the events between Lincoln's election and his inauguration. He conferred frequently with the abolitionist leaders of Boston, including Phillips and Garrison, and he disagreed violently with those who would let the "erring sisters" of the South depart in peace. Heinzen opposed every form of compromise. He argued against the right of secession and against the South's appeal to the right of revolution. He favored coercion and an immediate attack upon the southern states in order to prevent the formation of a confederacy and an appeal for foreign aid. Heinzen had abandoned

² Under the "two-year amendment" to the Massachusetts constitution, naturalized citizens could neither vote nor hold office until two years after they had completed their citizenship.

"brotherly reconciliation."³ He wanted war—to save the Union and to end slavery.

Many readers of the *Pionier* volunteered for service in the Union army, and the editor begged them to send him accounts of their experiences. Heinzen's report of alleged southern atrocities at the first Battle of Bull Run revealed his burning hatred for the South and was as extreme as that of the wildest abolitionist. The tales he published of southerners slaughtering wounded soldiers in cold blood, cutting off their noses and ears, and playing football with their heads prove again what war can do even to men like Heinzen who pride themselves on being rational beings. Heinzen apparently believed that many southerners were little less than cannibals, and he attributed their fiendishness to the kind of education they had received. He lost patience with the "Christian" warfare of the North, conducted by "political eunuchs." He denounced the Democrats as Copperheads and traitors who gave aid and comfort to the enemy, and the Republicans as weaklings, compromisers, grafters, and politicians utterly devoid of principle. He criticized the leadership in Washington and the military commanders in the field, but he admitted that the rank and file of the army were excellent. He denounced the waste and corruption of the administration. He exposed the gambling, drinking, and prostitution of the army camps, and he branded the German officers as some of the worst offenders.⁴

It is a well-known fact that the German element played an important role in the Union army. According to the actuary of the United States Sanitary Commission, the total number born in Germany who served as volunteers in the Civil War was 176,817. Other estimates place the number of German-born in the Union army as high as 216,000.⁵ Many recent immigrants

³ See "Die sibyllinischen Bücher," in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (Boston, 1871), II, 122–51.

⁴ See the lecture, "Salomonische Weisheit" (1862), in *ibid.*, pp. 152–91.

⁵ See Wilhelm Kaufmann, *Die Deutschen im amerikanischen Bürgerkriege* (Munich, 1911).

had no family ties to keep them from enlisting, the payment of bounties made volunteering financially attractive, and some Germans were actually recruited abroad and imported for service in American regiments.⁶ Many had received military training abroad and were especially useful in the artillery and engineering corps and in making military maps. For others, the United States served as an "overseas orphanage for cracked-up German officers."

Although Heinzen was eager to win the war, he did not enlist. He said frankly that his pen could be far more useful to the cause than his sword. He did not push volunteering among the Germans, unless they were ready to serve for higher reasons than personal prestige, money, epaulets, or "saving the Union with slavery," but he hoped that his countrymen would become a powerful factor in bringing about a rebirth of freedom in America as well as in Europe, and he favored raising a separate German army corps under Sigel. When conscription came, Heinzen defended its constitutionality but pleaded that it not be made retroactive to apply to immigrants who had not yet completed their naturalization. He opposed the provision enabling a man to buy his way out of the draft by paying three hundred dollars in cash.

The crop of "German colonels" created by the war excited Heinzen to some of his choicest vocabulary of denunciation. Before the war, he pointed out, every German adventurer and vagabond had become an editor—now he became a general. He undertook to expose these politicians and incompetents in uniform, especially if their position on slavery did not coincide with his. He praised Gustav Körner for refusing a commission, and during most of the war he wrote appreciatively of Sigel and contrasted his devotion and competence with the histrionics of Hecker, though the latter had insisted on enlisting as a private and had fought bravely in a number of engagements.

⁶ Fred A. Shannon, *The Organization and Administration of the Union Army, 1861-1865* (Cleveland, 1928), II, 78.

Heinzen took savage delight in pointing out the former occupations of these newly made German officers. One had been a politician and stationer in Hoboken, another a fortune-hunter, still another, a keeper of a bawdy-house. Many suddenly acquired new titles of nobility and blossomed out as "Baron von." He satirized the silly flattery of the German press which referred to the Germans as "the best soldiers" in the army; he made fun of the numerous flag presentations and festivities which marked the departure of German volunteers for the war front; and he deplored the pressure upon the President for appointments and commissions. "The first theater of war for most of the German colonels was the beerhouse," he wrote in the fall of 1861. Nevertheless, when Sigel was relieved of his command in Missouri by Halleck, and the *New York Times* and the *Tribune* made sharp comments about the "cowardly Dutchmen" who retreated at Chancellorsville, Heinzen was so enraged by this "revival of nativism" that he advised nominating a German presidential candidate or someone like Frémont who was friendly to the German group. Moreover, when the adjutant general ruled that only "regularly ordained clergymen" could serve as chaplains, Heinzen attacked the order not only as a violation of the First Amendment but as another insult to the Germans in the army.

Heinzen's most serious controversy with the epaulet-hunting German generals of the Civil War arose from his attack on Colonel Ludwig Blenker, who commanded a German brigade at Bull Run and came out unscathed in this first battle between two "armed mobs." Heinzen had listened to complaints about Sigel and the camp-following women who infested his quarters and about his alleged intrigues against Schurz, and he accepted letters accusing Steinwehr of financial irregularities, for he regarded himself as a clearing-house for all charges filed against German officers and used the *Pionier* to give them publicity. Blenker was a fellow-revolutionist of 1848-49, but there is no evidence to show that he had any significant contacts with Hein-

zen at that time. Though Blenker was vain and loved display, the *Pionier* commended him for an excellent performance at Bull Run and for the cleanliness, good order, and good health which prevailed among his men. Two months later, however, Blenker made the mistake of taking a Prussian "prince" into his brigade, and Heinzen's tone changed immediately. The *Pionier* accused Blenker of bootlicking in order to get a promotion and began to dig into his earlier record. The Colonel had been a wine merchant in Worms, a petty officer in the Greek revolution, and a commander of rebel forces in 1849. Heinzen concluded that none of these experiences fitted him to command a corps or a division. The *Pionier* repeated charges originally made in the *New York Tribune* that officers of Blenker's brigade were dividing profits of a thousand dollars a month derived from sales at army canteens, and Heinzen added the accusation that Blenker was censoring the newspapers which his men might read and did not permit the *Pionier* to circulate in his camp. By January, 1862, Blenker was represented in the *Pionier* as a "swindler and a jail bird" who had been dismissed from the Greek army, sentenced to six years in jail at Mainz for fraudulent bankruptcy, and branded as a thief and plunderer in one of Sigel's orders of the day during the Baden revolution.⁷

Heinzen commissioned a New York lawyer to look up the court records in Mainz, Germany. The latter found that a sentence of five years had been imposed and that, in 1849, Blenker had fled with what funds he had, leaving his debts behind him, but that there was no basis for the charge of "fraudulent bankruptcy." He also found that Sigel, who had referred to Blenker's "thieving proclivities" during the revolution of 1849, had later exonerated him. Heinzen was advised to proceed cautious-

⁷ See also Ferdinand Schreyer, *Geschichte der Revolution in Baden, 1848-49* (Darmstadt, 1909), p. 109, in which Blenker is accused of acts of terrorism and extortion at Lörrach, and *Nachträgliche Aufschlüsse über die badische Revolution in 1849* (New York, 1876), p. 159, in which Blenker is referred to as "Maul und Paradeheld." For a more favorable view see Corvin, *Aus dem Leben eines Volkskämpfers-Erinnerungen* (Amsterdam, 1861), III, 226-27.

ly in order to avoid a libel suit. Undaunted by this unexciting report, Heinzen promptly forwarded certain charges to the War Department, including an alleged judgment by a German court against Blenker and his wife for robbery, and a certification from a court in Hessen concerning alleged embezzlement at Worms. It seems clear that some of the charges arose from Blenker's participation in the revolution and were preferred against him after his escape to Switzerland. Other accusations reached Heinzen from various sources—from a German captain who was later dismissed as unfit for a military command because of "aberrations of the mind," from officers of Blenker's command, reporting grafting and profiteering at the expense of the soldiers, and from pure scandalmongers whose charges were anonymous. Heinzen apparently regarded them all as of equal validity.

The charges published in the *Pionier* against Blenker reached the floor of the Senate. Senator Grimes asked for a notarized statement about the court decision at Mainz and proposed to read it when Blenker's name came up for confirmation as a general. Senators Wilson, Grimes, and Wade spoke against his promotion, and the charges included illegal taxation of his men, making his division "a nursery of European princes and barons, essentially anti-Republican in their sentiments," selling sutler's privileges to the highest bidder, and permitting toasts to be drunk to the king of Prussia. Behind the scene the intense rivalry between the friends of Blenker and Sigel was apparent, and committees were in Washington to lobby for their favorites. In the end, Blenker was confirmed as a brigadier general. Less than a year and half later, in November, 1863, he died on his farm in New York State, "of a broken heart, hounded to death by a band of professional slanderers and political fanatics," to use the language of the *New Yorker Abendzeitung*.

It is difficult to appraise the merits of the Blenker case, especially since the accused remained silent and left his defense entirely to his friends. Blenker's personality provoked Hein-

zen's wrath, for the general loved the blare of bands, gaudy uniforms, and torchlight processions. Some of Blenker's officers were mere adventurers and members of that bogus nobility which the editor of the *Pionier* detested. Blenker's staff consumed much champagne, and beer was sold to the men, apparently at a profit of from six to eight thousand dollars a month to those who held the contract. There is no evidence that Blenker benefited personally by this arrangement, and he died poor on the farm to which he retired in 1863. The *Washington Star*, the *National Gazette*, and the *New York Tribune* apparently believed there was some basis for the charges against him, at least as far as the Quartermaster's Department was concerned. At least one division quartermaster was convicted by a military court, and Blenker was at one time suspended, pending an investigation. But General McClellan, never too friendly to German officers, praised him and his two adjutants as able officers. Jealousy, always rampant in the German regiments, was fed by a hunger for rapid promotion. Sigel, Struve, and other fellow-revolutionists of 1849 did not believe the charges against Blenker, and the majority of the officers in his outfit signed and published a statement supporting their commander. Some of the charges were utterly ridiculous, and it is rather amusing to find Heinzen, who favored the confiscation of royal property in time of revolution, making an issue of Blenker's filching of a silver cup belonging to Baron Dürkheim without waiting for a revolutionary committee to authorize the confiscation. J. M. Reichard, president of the provisional government of Baden and the Palatinate in 1849, and then a resident of New York, testified in the *Tribune* of February 26, 1862, that Blenker was a "liberal, honest, and brave man" and attributed the suit for fraudulent bankruptcy entirely to "malice and revenge." Struve wrote in a similar vein to the *Illinois Staatszeitung*, and similar letters were published in the *Pittsburgh Freiheitsfreund* and the *St. Louis Westliche Post*. Emil Pretorius, prominent lawyer of Missouri and formerly in the department of justice of Hessen, declared

the charges were false; and Sigel dismissed the whole "Baden episode" as too insignificant for discussion.

The Blenker case made Heinzen extremely unpopular with most of his colleagues, and he was accused of giving aid and comfort to the Know-Nothings by harping on the errors of his fellow-Germans. The *New Yorker Abendzeitung* reviewed Heinzen's career in the German revolution in most uncomplimentary terms and accused him of living on libel and scandal. The *Illinois Staatszeitung*, the *Philadelphia Freie Presse*, the *Anzeiger des Westens*, and the *Chicago Union and Telegraph* joined the chorus of denunciation. The Germans of Boston formally accused the editor of the *Pionier* of discouraging enlistments among the Germans, and at a special meeting called in Boston to censure Heinzen, only Louis Prang spoke in his defense.

Here we may leave the unhappy incident. The *Pionier* lost many subscribers because of it. The battle of words never reached a decisive conclusion, and the Blenker episode slowly faded from the pages of Heinzen's paper. That its editor was sincere in his attack need not be doubted. That he accepted, as reliable, evidence that rested on the most flimsy foundations and that he unearthed and exaggerated incidents that could have little bearing on Blenker's career in the Civil War is equally clear. The incident helped to fasten upon the *Pionier* the reputation that it was a journal devoted to quarreling merely for the sake of quarreling. Heinzen pursued the controversy as far as he could carry it, regardless of cost to himself or to his paper; but he had the courage and the decency to print in the *Pionier*, along with his charges against Blenker, most of the evidence which appeared to refute his accusations.

Far more disturbing to many of Heinzen's contemporaries than his attack on Blenker, and his occasional sallies against Schurz, Hecker, and Sigel, were the heavy broadsides the editor of the *Pionier* fired almost daily at President Lincoln. If Heinzen's ceaseless criticism of Lincoln's policies seems unusually severe to a generation brought up to revere the mar-

tyred president as the greatest American of all time, let it be remembered that Heizen's abolitionist views were shared by many others of his day who, like him, believed the President was prolonging the war by his policies of conciliation and compromise. There is much truth to Wendell Phillips' remark that the radicals were the driving power of the Republican party and that the administration was "unable to resist the Revolution" and was "overborne" by it. The radicals demanded immediate emancipation, the use of colored troops, the confiscation of rebel property, and civil and political equality for the Negro.

It was Wendell Phillips who said, "God grant us so many reverses that the government may learn its duty," and Charles Sumner who feared that victory might come too easily and thus leave the crime of slavery untouched. It should be recalled also that several Union generals acted as slave-catchers without rebuke from the President and that the Fugitive Slave Law was not repealed until 1864. To the radicals of the war years, Lincoln was anything but a hero. The *Springfield Republican* called him a "simple Susan," and Schurz thought the administration had delivered the army "into the hands of the enemies." Seward was blamed for the "cringing and whining policy" of his chief and described by Joseph Medill as "Lincoln's evil genius," who "kept a sponge saturated with chloroform to Uncle Abe's nose." Murat Halstead, editor of the *Cincinnati Commercial*, in a letter to John Sherman in 1863 called Lincoln "an awful, woeful ass" and wrote to Chase that he would like to take the President "by the throat and knock his head against a wall until he is brought to his senses on the war business." To the radicals, the clubfooted Thaddeus Stevens and the "god-like Sumner,"⁸ and extremists like Zach Chandler and Ben Wade,

⁸ For these and similar quotations see T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and the Radicals* (Madison, Wis., 1941); George Fort Milton, *Abraham Lincoln and the Fifth Column* (New York, 1942); and Wood Gray, *The Hidden Civil War: The Story of the Copperheads* (New York, 1942).

were the real heroes of the war and of the reconstruction period. When Lincoln died, these Jacobins shed few tears and hailed Andrew Johnson as "a godsend to the country."

Heinzen began criticizing Lincoln the moment he left Springfield for Washington. The president-elect's preinaugural speeches seemed to reveal an honest, well-meaning, but weak and vacillating leader. Heinzen was especially angry because Lincoln promised to enforce the Fugitive Slave Law and to guarantee slavery where it existed. He wanted no peacemaker in the White House who would become involved in the "dualism of compromise." To the editor of the *Pionier*, Jefferson Davis appeared far more forthright and logical, and, as the war progressed, Heinzen several times gave the Confederate president credit for forcing Lincoln into a more positive course of action. Heinzen wanted the southern forts reinforced and held, the tariffs collected in the South by force if necessary, and a generous use of rope, gallows, and bullets in dealing with traitors, after the fashion of Andrew Jackson nearly thirty years earlier.

Lincoln's first inaugural address was described in the *Pionier* as "a formless, wooden, inept document," too comforting to traitors and not forceful enough to satisfy the friends of freedom. The editor was particularly irked by its many references to the deity. Heinzen blamed the Republican administration for handing the initiative to the rebels and "saving the Union by abandoning it." He was sure that the President need not wait for Congress in order to suppress the rebellion and that his "war powers" were entirely adequate to the task. He chafed over the time lost, during which the Confederates consolidated their strength and prepared for hostilities. He predicted that Spain and France would seize this opportunity to challenge the Monroe Doctrine and foment trouble in Haiti and Mexico. He attacked the administration for selecting poor generals and following a stupid strategy, for its inaction and its inept cabinet; and he offered strategic plans of his own for the rapid conquest of the South. In July, 1861, the editor of the *Pionier* was summoned

before the mayor and chief of police of Boston for having printed an editorial urging the army to mutiny and to drive Lincoln, the cabinet, and General Scott from office. The mayor threatened to suppress the *Pionier*. Heinzen pleaded freedom of the press and invited an appeal to the courts, and there the matter ended.

The attacks on Lincoln increased in violence. Heinzen called the President "the Republican Buchanan," "a heartless imbecile," "a man with a leather soul, wooden brain and stony heart." He suggested that his marriage to a southern woman, with relatives in the rebel army, might account for the President's inaction and reported with evident delight many accounts of Mrs. Lincoln's extravagances in the White House. Heinzen conceded the President's honesty, but he found him to be without statesman-like insight or scientific training, wily, shy, vacillating, and guilty of doing "too little and too late." He held him personally responsible for failures in the field and in European diplomacy, for the waste and corruption in Washington, and for the censorship of the press and public assemblies in violation of the Bill of Rights.

The "Trent" affair caused Heinzen many anxious moments. He expected European intervention, yet when Mason and Slidell were surrendered to the British, he pronounced the decision a national degradation and a capitulation to English arrogance. He urged the immediate shifting of American war aims from preservation of the Union to emancipation of the Negro, for he was convinced that neither England nor France would dare to intervene as "the restorers of slavery." He criticized Lincoln's appeal for clemency in his Gettysburg Address and re-wrote it in terms of revenge for John Brown's martyrdom.⁹ But, in spite of his hostility to the administration, Heinzen had no traffic with Democrats or Copperheads. These he denounced as traitors, and he considered Vallandigham particu-

⁹ See Heinzen's lecture, "Mankind the Criminal," delivered in Washington and privately printed in Roxbury.

larly "poisonous," though he defended his right to freedom of speech, even to the extent of "misusing "it.

Emancipation of the Negro was slow in coming, and Heinzen, like hundreds of other radical abolitionists, chafed over the delay. He had denounced General Butler's order treating escaped slaves as contraband of war, and he hailed the proclamations of Generals Hunter and Frémont, freeing slaves in their districts by military order, as "the greatest deed of the war" and as acts of genuine "moral courage." Lincoln's famous answer to Horace Greeley's "Prayer of the Twenty Million" was in Heinzen's opinion "a well-intentioned commonplace" and but further evidence of the administration's indecision. He opposed Lincoln's plan for emancipation by compensating the owners as impractical and unacceptable to the slave states and proposed instead the emancipation of the slaves of all rebels, with possible compensation for those southerners who had remained loyal to the Union, and he objected strenuously to any suggestion to deport freed Negroes to a territory of their own. Instead, he demanded that they be given the opportunity to develop their abilities wherever they happened to be, and he favored giving every Negro family at least ten acres of land.

When the Emancipation Proclamation finally came, Heinzen interpreted it as a military measure that did not go far enough. He agreed with Wendell Phillips that "Jefferson Davis wrote the Emancipation Proclamation" and considered Lincoln merely "the weak and resisting instrument through which the mighty and unfailing logic of events brought about an act of liberation." He realized that the proclamation had no value unless implemented by force and called at once for Negro troops to be sent into the South, where their ranks could be swelled by a slave insurrection. He regarded the proclamation as a concession both to the radicals of the North and to the "despots "of Europe—an "immoral act" which used the emancipation of human beings as a tool of war. Heinzen knew that the proclamation would lose its force the moment the war ended, and therefore he demanded

immediate action by Congress to end slavery everywhere and to provide constitutional guaranties against its re-establishment. Many others shared Heinzen's view that the President's proclamation freed the slaves where Lincoln's word carried no weight and left them in chains where he could have unshackled them.

In 1863 Heinzen wrote several powerful editorials against "appeasement" and peace by negotiation. He wanted a peace based on the complete conquest of the South, the punishment of its leaders, the confiscation of enough property to pay the costs of the war, the end of slavery, and a new order based on the disarmament of the South, the formation of a Negro militia, and the encouragement of immigration to resettle the southern states. He would have dismissed generals like Halleck and Thomas and all of the cabinet, except Chase; he would have had the Army of the Potomac advance simultaneously with one coming up from North Carolina; he would have recruited fifty thousand Negro soldiers, under General Butler at Fort Monroe, and a similar Negro army in the South; he would have forced every officer to take an oath to carry out the Emancipation Proclamation; and he would have enforced the confiscation acts, seized all weapons in rebel districts on pain of execution, and held rebel officers and influential southerners as hostages to guarantee fair treatment of Negro troops and their officers. Finally, he favored a capital levy to finance the war.

By 1863 discontent among the radicals with what Senator W. P. Fessenden called the "shambling half-and-half set of incapables collected" in Washington began to crystallize into proposals for a new political party. The demand for political action spread rapidly in German radical circles. The *Pionier* suggested on May 27 that Frémont, who had "saved the honor of the Republic" by his blow against slavery in Missouri, be nominated for president in 1864; and papers like the *Michigan Journal* (Detroit), the St. Louis *Neue Zeit*, the *Newark Freie Zeitung*, the Indianapolis *Freie Presse*, the Cleveland *Wächter am Erie*, the *New York Demokrat*, the Illinois *Belleviller Zeitung*,

the *Davenport Demokrat*, and the *Quincy Tribune* promptly indorsed the proposal. Five weeks later a call originated in Washington, with the so-called "German National Central Committee," for a national convention of German-American organizations to fight conservatism, rebellion, and copperheadism and to make German voters something more than "a spineless appendix" and the "political helots" of the major parties.

Radical clubs were promptly organized among the Germans, especially among the "freethinking element," in many cities, including New York, St. Louis, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Boston, Milwaukee, Newark, Hartford, Detroit, and Washington. Heinzen himself presided at a meeting in the Boston Turner Hall and secured the approval of a thoroughly abolitionist, equal rights' platform and the indorsement of Frémont for president, and he quickly assumed a place of leadership in the movement. In a preliminary organization meeting held in Cleveland in October, 1863, the editor of the *Pionier* served as one of the delegates from Boston.

At Cleveland, Heinzen denied all intention to "Germanize America," but he demanded that the Germans exercise more influence as American citizens. "The best republican is the best patriot, no matter where he was born." The gathering in Cleveland was small, and many influential Germans, like Judge Bernhard Stallo, Reinhold Solger, and Carl Schurz, refused to participate, primarily because of their many disagreements with its leading spirit. There were sharp cleavages in the convention itself, because of foreign policy and the extent to which the members should concern themselves with a general program of social reform. Heinzen's group was in the majority, however, and its leader wrote the platform which was eventually approved. The minority was led by Friedrich Kapp and other easterners, many of whom were conservative lawyers. A vote on the plank favoring a foreign policy which would encourage revolutions in Europe, as a defensive measure against European intervention in America, carried 45 to 24. Heinzen made a

dramatic appeal in support of his gospel of revolution, and the differences between Kapp and Heinzen became more violent as the discussions progressed. Most of the influential German-language papers ignored the entire proceedings, and only a few American papers gave publicity to the platform that was eventually adopted. Heinzen, like Thaddeus Stevens, wished to use the war to remodel American institutions, and he fought hard to incorporate in the platform a complete program of political and social reform.

The platform of 1863 foreshadowed that of the more important convention held in Cleveland the following year. It denounced states' rights and demanded the unconditional suppression of the rebellion and the complete abolition of slavery. It called for a revision of the Constitution in conformity with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. The southern states were to be treated as "territories for the purpose of reconstruction," and the confiscated estates of slaveholders were to be distributed, by a homestead policy, to former slaves. One notable plank demanded the vigorous enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine and American support for all European revolutionary movements and eloquently expressed Heinzen's conviction that the "North American Republic cannot be safe and enjoy liberty as long as the rest of the world is in chains." The platform also stressed civil rights, denounced usurpation of power by the army, and requested a national militia system based on the Swiss model of universal service. The *Wächter am Erie* and the *Pionier* were designated as the "official organs of the German Organization."

Heinzen left Cleveland in high spirits. For the first time he felt "politically at home in America," and for the first time German radicals had done something which won his respect. He believed the foundations had been laid for a new "Liberty party" and for Frémont's candidacy in 1864. It did not disturb him that the majority of the German element thought otherwise and that some of the radical clubs resented his browbeating

of the Cleveland delegates. "All opposition to the Cleveland Convention," wrote one correspondent of the *Pionier*, "is because of you personally." Brentano was disgusted with the platform, and Schünemann-Pott, editor of the *Philadelphia Blätter für freies religiöses Leben*, complained because a plank on religious freedom had been overlooked. Heinzen replied that the issue was too dangerous to raise in such a heterogeneous assembly. When the majority of the German-language press openly repudiated the Cleveland Convention, Heinzen was comforted by the large number of German workers' organizations which indorsed his platform.

In February, 1864, Heinzen made his first visit to the national capitol. He was not impressed by Washington's general appearance and architecture or by the debates he heard in Congress. He liked the Patent Office, as concrete evidence of American inventiveness and enterprise, but thought the White House "too big for one man." He lectured to an audience of three hundred and attended a banquet given in his honor by his German admirers. But the real purpose of the visit seems to have been to sound out radical senators and representatives and to discuss foreign policy with them. He visited Secretary Chase, still one of the hopes of the radicals, and was most courteously received.

Heinzen's personal choice for 1864 was "the Pathfinder," John C. Frémont, a true champion of freedom and equality for the Negro. The movement to nominate "the Pathfinder" for president in 1864, in place of Lincoln, probably started in Missouri, a hotbed of Republican radicalism ever since Frémont had been removed from his command in 1861. By the late spring of 1864 many German papers had indorsed Frémont, including the *Iowa Staatszeitung* and the *St. Louis Westliche Post*, and Frémont clubs had been organized among the radical Germans of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and other states. Horace Greeley and Governor Andrew of Massachusetts probably gave secret support to the uprising against Lincoln, which gathered into its

fold many shades of political discontent, from militant abolitionists to disgruntled Democrats. Heinzen kept busy in New England, organizing radical clubs, and he signed the official call for the Cleveland Convention. He explained that he disapproved of the presidency as an institution but was ready to help radical Germans to assert their political independence.

Heinzen arrived early in Cleveland to attend the meeting of German delegates called in advance of the more general gathering. On May 29 a total of twenty-seven German radical delegates assembled, representing ten states and the District of Columbia, and twenty-two clubs. Three Frémont men attended the afternoon session, including General John Cochrane, soon to be nominated as Frémont's running mate. Resolutions were adopted favoring a new party and repudiating all compromise with Lincoln Republicans. The platform approved by the German delegates was nearly identical with the principles adopted the preceding autumn. It was printed in English and given to all the delegates of the Cleveland Convention. Frémont gave it his approval. Heinzen was elected a member of the executive committee.

About four hundred delegates attended the convention proper. They came, in the main, from Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. To avoid the appearance of too much German influence, all the preliminary officers were Americans. Heinzen and five other Germans, however, served on the platform committee of fourteen. The platform defended civil rights, demanded the extinction of slavery by constitutional amendment, reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine, advocated the popular election of presidents and for one term only, favored congressional reconstruction, and called for the confiscation of rebel estates and their redistribution among soldiers and settlers, white or colored. Some of these planks clearly reveal the influence of the German delegation, and Heinzen was satisfied. Frémont and Cochrane were nominated as the standard-bearers of the "Radical Democracy." Reassembling by themselves, the Ger-

man delegates unanimously accepted the results of the convention. Heinzen returned to Boston via Niagara and wished he might put Seward, Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Napoleon III, William I, and Francis Joseph II into one boat and send them over the Falls.

Frémont resigned his commission, accepted the nomination, repudiated the last plank in the platform, and agreed to withdraw if the Republicans nominated a satisfactory candidate other than Lincoln. The administration press referred to the delegates as adventurers, visionaries, fanatics, spiritualists, free lovers, and Ishmaelites. The *Cleveland Herald* turned its scorn upon the "impetuous hair-brained Germans," and papers like the *Boston Transcript* and the *Cincinnati Commercial* deplored their part in the movement. Thurlow Weed called the whole business a "slimy intrigue."¹⁰

Heinzen and Wendell Phillips conferred with Frémont, at the latter's invitation, at his country place at Nahant, near Lynn, to talk policy and strategy. They left thoroughly satisfied, and Heinzen wrote in extravagant terms of Frémont's honesty, nobility, and dependability and seemed to feel that his election might actually rehabilitate the discredited presidency which he wished to abolish. The *Pionier* addressed special appeals to German clubs, and the opposition promptly labeled Heinzen a traitor and a Copperhead and intimated that he had been promised an ambassadorship in the event of Frémont's election.

Signs appeared early on the political horizon to indicate that "the Pathfinder" might withdraw from the contest before election day. In that event, Heinzen advised the selection of another candidate or throwing the election into the House of Representatives. The Republicans tried to hold the German vote in line for Lincoln by every possible political device, and Schurz served as the head of their foreign-language bureau. On September 22 Frémont withdrew his candidacy. He was in Boston

¹⁰ See Ruhl Jacob Bartlett, *John C. Frémont and the Republican Party* (Columbus, 1930).

six days later but did not see Heinzen, though he sent him word of his decision. The *Pionier* had little to say, except to express respect for Frémont's motives, without approving his act or the reasons for it. Heinzen blamed the return of the "cowards in the party" to the Republican fold, after the fall of Atlanta, for Frémont's decision, and the latter's fears of a Democratic victory. "The party founded at Cleveland," Heinzen wrote, "is now an army that has been dismissed, without a flag . . . and yielded without a battle." He recommended that German radicals go into "winter quarters," vote for neither Lincoln nor McClellan, and continue their activities as the "advance guard" of radical progress. German Frémont clubs were rapidly converted into Lincoln clubs; Schurz became the leading stump speaker for the Republicans; and Wade and Chase campaigned for Lincoln. Heinzen said farewell to Frémont, though he and many others voted for him in November. Many Germans stayed away from the polls; the majority probably voted for Lincoln in order to avert a Democratic victory. Heinzen reiterated his earlier demand that the presidency be abolished. He rejoiced that McClellan was defeated, and all the slave-traders and traitors with him, but he could not anticipate another four years of Lincoln with any degree of satisfaction.¹¹

Lincoln's second inaugural address was specially displeasing to the *Pionier*. It seemed like "a prayer or an appeal to a ghost above the clouds." Shortly thereafter Lincoln was assassinated. Heinzen condemned Booth's fanatical act, but he believed Lincoln's death would prove a blessing for the country. In an editorial, entitled "The Murder of Lincoln," he restated his belief in tyrannicide but denied that Lincoln's death belonged in that category. He referred to Booth as a plain murderer, who had been guilty of "a criminal interference with the functions of popular government." "The polemic against Lincoln ends with his death," he wrote, "but this does not mean that it will be con-

¹¹ See also Andreas Dorpalen, "The German Element and the Issues of the Civil War," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXIX, 55-76.

verted into an apologia." He hoped that Lincoln's policy of reconstruction would be completely reversed. He did not like the pomp and circumstance that marked the funeral ceremonies for the dead president, as his body was slowly carried back to Springfield, for they reminded him of royal burials. He maintained that Lincoln had been neither god nor saint, only a "weak person, of average ability . . . controlled by events which he did not foresee." Like most radicals, he expected Andrew Johnson to hang traitors and make treason odious. Heinzen's editorials infuriated the majority of the Germans, who regarded them as indecent attacks carried beyond the grave; and threats were made to mob Heinzen and destroy his press. The *New Yorker Abendzeitung* and the head of the New York *Turnverein* held him and his fellow-radicals responsible for Lincoln's death.

Heinzen's attitude on reconstruction can be briefly summarized. He believed firmly in the potentialities of the Negro, and he would admit no inherent racial differences. He favored an invasion of the South in order to change its whole social structure. He was afraid that military victory might be betrayed by a peace of reconciliation. He wanted a redistribution of southern landed property and confiscation as "the principal resource from which [the nation] could expect indemnification for a part of the cost of the war." He wanted Congress, not the president, to reconstruct the South, and he was ready to grant Negroes citizenship, suffrage, and the right to serve in the militia. He wanted to educate the colored man at public expense; he would not have opposed mixed marriages; and he hoped to make rebel leaders politically impotent. All this he described as "punishment," not revenge. He was opposed to the execution of traitors, but he favored banishment and denying them the rights of citizens. The *Pionier* featured atrocity tales to prove that the South was unregenerate and that the Negro was still the victim of brutal terror.

Heinzen hailed the Thirteenth Amendment abolishing slavery

as the prelude to military reconstruction and equal rights, but it did not take him long to lose faith in Johnson. When the latter reversed his earlier policy of vindictiveness and revenge, to follow in the footsteps of the more conciliatory Lincoln, the radicals gave up hope and turned to Congress for salvation. Heinzen, who had found the style of Johnson's first message better than Lincoln's, demonstrating the superiority of the "tailor over the rail-splitter," and who had approved of the new president's denial of amnesty to the large property-holders, now held Johnson responsible for the surrender of defenseless freedmen to their former masters. He suspected him of personal prejudice and of wanting to keep the Negro "in his place." By August, 1865, the *Pionier* demanded the impeachment of the President. "Johnson is a traitor to the North and to his party," the editor wrote, and he joined in the popular pastime of the radicals in spreading false tales about Johnson's love of whiskey. Heinzen apparently believed that the President was intent upon destroying all the fruits of victory and was actually planning a coup d'état to seize control of the government.

Heinzen thought that Congress had the power to establish Negro suffrage without resorting to the roundabout methods of the Fourteenth Amendment. He favored Sumner's civil rights' bill, and he criticized the Fifteenth Amendment for its failure to include the right of office-holding among its guaranties. In the light of later developments it is interesting to add that Heinzen forecast the adoption of educational and property-holding tests to circumvent the intent of the amendment and to keep the Negro from voting. He accepted military reconstruction in all its radical entirety and frequently wrote of the need for a discriminating use of cannonshot and hemp. On the other hand, he opposed making Captain Wirz of Andersonville Prison the scapegoat for all Confederate sins, and he denounced the prolonged incarceration of Jefferson Davis without trial and advised him to sue the government for illegal imprisonment.

By 1868 Heinzen was forced to admit that southern recon-

struction had been badly bungled. The propertyless Negro was still without land, education, or arms, and the plantations had not been systematically broken up. Heinzen had no faith in Grant, and he regretted that the Force Acts proved so ineffective. In 1877, following the disputed Hayes-Tilden election, the last federal troops were withdrawn from the South. Heinzen predicted that the Negro would be reduced to a state of peonage. He opposed President Hayes's desires "to close the bloody chasm" and objected vigorously to a poll tax in Virginia as a device for disfranchising the colored voter.

The Civil War era ended with many radical demands unfulfilled and with a deliberate nullification of many reconstruction measures, as the South returned to its old Democratic allegiance. Heinzen was disappointed, but he continued to champion the rights of the Negro and to insist on complete equality between the races. As the war years faded into history, Heinzen directed his attention to other issues.

The war had driven the Democratic party out of Washington, but Heinzen quickly sensed that the Republican party, born during a great humanitarian crusade, was changing rapidly into a party of capitalists, monopolists, and big-business entrepreneurs, who put property rights above human rights. The Grant administration represented, with one possible exception, the most unscrupulous corruption, exploitation, and spoils politics in the history of the nation. Heinzen revolted against the party discipline which was forging new fetters for the American people. Many of his friends believed that humanity had reached its final goal in the freeing of the slaves and saw nothing left to fight for. But, for Heinzen, the postwar period merely marked the beginning of a new and greater battle for human rights.

CHAPTER NINE

A BLUEPRINT FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

GERMAN RADICALISM, AS HEINZEN ONCE WROTE to his friend, F. E. Abbot, editor of the freethought Boston *Index*, "treats human progress as a coherent movement embracing every human interest." It was inconceivable that the tremendous energies of the "Boston Thunderer" should be exhausted even in so violent a controversy as the battle over slavery and the preservation of the Union. Heinzen had a comprehensive plan for the total reshaping of the American republic in conformity with the tenets of materialistic radicalism, and anything that stopped short of a complete overhauling of the governmental and social structure of the United States he regarded as a compromise with the forces of reaction.

In Europe the young Heinzen had favored the use of direct action and force in the battle with reactionary monarchies; in America he found such methods unnecessary. No matter how radical, and even bizarre, some of his proposals may have seemed to his American contemporaries, it must always be remembered that he was willing to have their fate decided in the arena of free speech and public debate. Freedom of speech and freedom of the press were the virtues of the American constitutional system which Heinzen revered most highly. He wrote clearheaded defenses of the Bill of Rights in language comparable to John Stuart Mill's eloquent treatise *On Liberty*. In a long

journalistic debate with Paul Lindau of the Berlin *Gegenwart*, he expressed his deep appreciation of the freedom which he was permitted to enjoy in the country of his adoption.

Many Americans render lip service to the Bill of Rights without really understanding what it means. Obviously, freedom of speech and of the press have no significance unless they include freedom for a hated minority to offer its views in the market place of ideas. "Why talk about freedom of the press," Heinzen asked, "if it does not include freedom to criticize? The freedom to praise is universal." He applied this principle without equivocation. He pleaded for complete freedom of speech in Congress for the Copperheads and appeasers during the Civil War and for the editors of "secession papers" who were mobbed in northern cities in 1861. He opposed taxes on paper, lest Congress use them as a device against a free press, and he protested the postmaster-general's power to bar publications from the mails. He fought for journals like *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* when they were attacked by the Comstock forces for publishing so-called obscene literature, and he resigned as one of the vice-presidents of the Liberal League of America in 1878 when that organization took an equivocal stand on a proposed law to suppress such material.¹

Heinzen believed that every public figure must submit to newspaper criticism and attack as one of the prices he has to pay for his position of prominence, and he regretted that officials did not reply in kind to these "personal" attacks in the public press. He boldly faced the question of civil liberty in wartime but, like others who have considered the problem, recognized the difficulties in deciding where to draw the line between the proper use and the abuse of free speech. On one occasion he concluded that he would support a temporary dictatorship if the United States should be attacked by European powers. But, short of such a disaster, he was opposed to martial law and military arrests when the civil courts were open. Only

¹ See *The Index* (Boston), December 12, 1878.

in case of extreme danger, when the Constitution itself was suspended, would he have accepted a temporary suspension of civil liberties. Every folly, he argued, deserves a hearing. How else can progress be made? Bad ideas can be combated only with good ideas, and words must be countered with words. Heinzen extended his argument to include those who advocated "murder, riot, and treason," for a man who preaches murder in a peaceful society would surely be laughed out of court. "No injury . . . by a treasonable journal," he insisted, could be compared with the evil results of its arbitrary suppression. Without "the free exchange and battle of ideas," men would never be able to distinguish a fool from a knave or what is to be laughed at and what is to be despised.

Heinzen loved to quote Robespierre's speech of 1791 on freedom of the press and staunchly maintained that without the "impudence" of the press, and the right of every editor to tell the world what was going on in his head, there could be no freedom. He would have preferred to give up the parliamentary system, habeas corpus, and other legal devices to safeguard the rights of individuals rather than freedom of speech, for he believed that if this were preserved, all the rest could be regained. Heinzen favored punishing violations of freedom of the press by death, though he believed capital punishment should be abolished for all other crimes. Several times he suggested the need to raise funds by public subscription in order to defend publishers involved in litigation threatening their freedom. Heinzen had the highest ideals for his profession. He considered independent journalism the most honorable career to which a man of principle and integrity could aspire.

Heinzen's views on democratic government may best be understood by noting the contents of one of his most widely known publications, *What Is Real Democracy*, printed first in German, then translated, and circulated in both languages by the Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles, as a preliminary to the presidential campaign of 1872. Heinzen regarded the state

as the product of conscious effort and the application of thought and reason, not as "an organic development." He rejected the theory that all things happen according to "the logic of events" for the thesis that they are determined by the logical application of correct and just principles. Heinzen made no distinction between nation and people. He believed that all people, including women, were entitled to equal rights to participate in the life of the state and that "the will of the people" was but another term for majority rule. He admitted that minority rights and not majority rule were the real tests of genuine democracy and maintained that the primary rights of a people for self-government should never be delegated to any representative or executive group beyond the power of easy modification and recall.

The United States Constitution, in the opinion of the *Pionier*, was an unhappy and undesirable compromise between a unitary state and states' rights, between a republic and a monarchy, a democracy and an aristocracy, slavery and liberty. Heinzen admitted that it was the best of its time but insisted that it needed drastic amendment. Once an ardent champion of federalism, he reviewed the history of the leading federations of the world and concluded that all of them had resulted from outside pressures and had come to an end when the external dangers no longer existed. He attributed a large measure of the responsibility for the Civil War to the American system of federalism, and he was now ready to discard it as an obstacle to democracy and progress. Completely impervious to historical traditions, and having decided that what was needed was a single, centralized, unified legal, governmental, and educational system, he proposed that the states be dissolved and their costly legislatures disbanded and that they be superseded by "provinces," to be administered by deputies of the central authority. He abandoned his earlier fears of centralization, provided that the legislative and executive powers be combined and exercised in accordance with the parliamentary theory of ministerial responsi-

bility. He repudiated the American system of checks and balances and separation of powers and favored a Congress elected without residence requirements.

The presidency provoked Heinzen's sharpest attacks. He looked upon the chief executive as "a king in dresscoat" and upon the office as a compromise with monarchy. He analyzed the legal and extra-legal powers of the president with expert precision. He saw the relation of the office to party politics and to political patronage, and he hated both. He advocated the marshaling of voters behind a cause, not a man; and he would have preferred the specific formation of a party to sponsor specific principles in each election, so that the "general will" might be ascertained, uninfluenced by partisanship, "party spirit," or political spoilsmen.

The result of this reasoning was a demand to abolish the presidency and the Senate, to reduce Congress to a unicameral body in order to decrease party pressures, and to provide a method of recalling not only the people's representatives but unpopular measures as well. In place of the presidency Heinzen wanted to establish a body like the Swiss executive council or an administrative group after the pattern of a cabinet, with a congressional committee to watch it during vacations of the legislative branch. As far as the judiciary was concerned, Heinzen agreed that "learned and honest judges must be secured, but he favored having them elected and removable by the people. For the Supreme Court he would have substituted a "judicial commission of Congress" to determine the constitutionality of controversial measures, for he always held that the authority of Congress must transcend that of the Court. In addition, Heinzen had great faith in frequent plebiscites. His goal was to achieve as much direct, primary democracy as possible, and he believed that the way to train men for democracy is to let them practice it at every stage. He was not disturbed because democracy was slow and inefficient, and he preferred it, with all its mistakes and shortcomings, to all other types of government,

simply because it gave people the satisfaction of acting for themselves, respected the value of each individual, and allowed the opposition complete freedom of criticism.

These fundamental principles underlay all the agitation for political reform which emanated from the offices of the *Pionier*. Heinzen sometimes wrote that he was "sick of politics" and "sick of politicians," but he never ceased agitating for his variety of radical democracy. He knew that politics were essential in a self-governing nation and that the greatest vice of a democratic people was indifference to the public welfare.

Heinzen's jibes at the presidential office began almost immediately upon his arrival in the United States, in the *Deutsche Schnellpost*, and particularly in the *Janus*, in 1852. He described the "hokum" of presidential campaigns, the "stereotyped repetitions" of the same comic performance every four years when the sovereign people marched to the polls to choose another "king in dresscoat." He preferred a life-term to these recurrent orgies of partisanship and demagoguery. By 1867 he was advocating a new party to abolish the presidency and the Senate, that "brake created by conservatism on the progress of a people and a parliamentary assistant of the reactionary president." In petitions to Congress he demanded a constitutional amendment to reconstruct the executive branch and to eliminate the monarchical features of the American system of government.

Heinzen contended that the Founding Fathers had created an "elective monarchy," that any compromise between absolute monarchy and absolute democracy was "untenable" and "deceptive," and that the powers of the presidency had steadily grown because that office was a "constant object of public attention, the center of all political action, the organ of all national manifestations, the source of all favors . . . the pivot of partisanship and the mainspring of corruption." In time of war, he argued, the Chief Executive was "sole arbiter of the nation's destiny" and had control of all the national resources; in time of peace, many of the "agencies" of government, including the

Supreme Court charged with trying violations of the Constitution, were "his creatures." Heinzen had expected a coup d'état in the Lincoln administration, and the Johnson impeachment trial convinced him that no president could be removed from office. The scandals of the Grant administration added further arguments for abolishing the whole presidential system.²

The *Pionier* in 1868 printed petitions advocating the abolition of the presidency and gave instructions as to how they were to be signed and dispatched to Washington. Senators Schurz and Sumner presented these requests to the upper chamber, and Butler did the same in the House of Representatives. Petitions came in from Boston, St. Louis, Detroit, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Dubuque, St. Paul, Quincy, Newark, and other communities. The *New York Times* branded the agitation as "ludicrous," but the *London Spectator* discussed the proposal at length. Wendell Phillips wrote Heinzen that he found it an "able" suggestion and "of great importance" but that he was not yet convinced. The *New York Nation* also took the petitions seriously and referred to Heinzen as "a thoroughly brave, outspoken and honest man" of great ability. Other papers, like the *New York Anti-slavery Standard*, the *Missouri Demokrat*, the *Sandusky Register*, and the *Courrier des Etats-Unis* of New York, discussed the movement but did not indorse it.

Grant's administration fired Heinzen to almost fanatical hatred for the presidency. He distrusted all soldier-presidents and was alarmed to find twenty-eight generals in Congress. He described Grant as "the great master of silence," qualified for president of a "tobacco or jockey club," whose "main strength and greatest passion lay in smoking the stinking weed and driving fast horses." These were harsh terms, even for a crusading journalist, but the *Chicago Zukunft*, which agreed with the *Pionier*, went even further and referred to the President as "a smoking, whiskey-drinking, know-nothing wearer of epaulets."

² *Memorial to the Congress of the United States regarding the Abolition of the Presidency* (Indianapolis, n.d.). Pp. 8.

In the fall of 1868 Heinzen sponsored and circulated a radical ticket for "No President at All." He had it printed in Indianapolis and distributed from Boston, with the request that all true radicals drop it into the ballot boxes on election day in place of the regular party tickets. The *Pionier* of August 5, 1868, appealed to its readers in rhyme:

A VOICE TO THE PEOPLE

I would proclaim from shore to shore
Of this beloved land;
O people, lay your might no more
Into a single hand;
And if you cast your vote again
For President, next Fall,
Your tickets let these words contain:
"No President at all!"

According to Heinzen's calculations, about five hundred of these tickets were dropped into the ballot boxes in 1868. Undismayed, the reformer prepared at once for the next campaign.

In 1872 Heinzen took no part in the Liberal Republican revolt which nominated Greeley for president, for he regarded it as a dishonest compromise and an opportunist appeal to all the disgruntled. He hoped for Grant's re-election, in order that the executive branch of the government might be completely discredited. German radicals and freethinkers met in Milwaukee, Detroit, Brooklyn, New York, and elsewhere to support Heinzen's campaign against the presidency, and a number of English newspapers took notice of this renewed activity. Meetings were held in the Turner halls, and local committees were created to carry on a vigorous campaign of education. About thirty thousand "protest" tickets were distributed on the eve of the election. Heinzen received numerous letters from voters who dropped their ballots into the boxes, only to have them thrown out or merely listed among the "scattering votes." The *Pionier* estimated that five thousand votes were cast for the cause in 1872. They were scattered widely among the German radical

INDEPENDENT TICKET

FOR THE

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN, 1868

Neither GRANT nor SEYMOUR!

No President at all!

**ABOLITION OF THE MONARCHICAL
OFFICE!**

**Government of the People through
its Responsible Agents in
Congress!**

**REVISION of the UNITED STATES
CONSTITUTION!**

**THE TICKET OF THE HEINZEN RADICALS IN THE
ELECTION CAMPAIGN OF 1868**

centers of the United States. The *Milwaukee Sentinel*, for example, reported on November 8, 1872: " 'No President at all' was the vote of two hundred of our citizens on Tuesday last. They were all Germans of the Karl Heinzen school."³

Undaunted by the slow progress of the movement, the effort to abolish the presidency was renewed in 1876, with another "independent electoral ticket." Besides the *Pionier*, it had the lusty support of several other radical German papers, like the *Freidenker* of Milwaukee and the *Deutscher Anzeiger* of Providence, Rhode Island. On election day the ticket received about a hundred and fifty votes each in Boston and Newark, a hundred in Cincinnati, three hundred in Detroit, forty-four in Milwaukee, and scattered support in other cities. Heinzen explained the apparent slump by the fact that many radicals had voted Republican in order to prevent a Democratic victory. In 1880 Heinzen was too feeble to take much part in the presidential campaign. But he fought as vigorously as his strength permitted against a third term for Grant and restated his familiar views about the presidency, appealing especially to the Turner societies for support.⁴ In what turned out to be his last editorial, he suggested renaming the executive mansion the "Red House," in view of the many soldier-presidents who had occupied it. For a decade after his death, German radicals continued to send

³ A large poster, six by three feet, used in the campaign of 1872 contained these words: "Protest Ticket of the Radical Democrats. Neither Grant Nor Greeley. No President at all. No More Kings in Dresscoats. Abolition of the Presidency. The Source of all Corruption, all Party Tyranny, and all anti-Republican Intrigues. Annexation of the White House to the Capitol. The Executive Power to be absorbed by the Legislative. The Separation and Balance of Powers is an antiquated expedient and pernicious delusion. Intellect and Will, Will and Action, Resolution and Execution, belong together. The Sovereignty of the People to be vindicated and made efficient by uniting all powers in the hands of its *responsible* legislative agents. The Executive only an administrative Commission of Congress. Real Democracy. The Only Remedy and Safeguard."

⁴ See Heinzen's contributions to the *Freidenker*, March 21, May 9, June 20, and October 17, 1880.

petitions to Congress to carry out the demands of their dead leader. One of the petitions had fourteen hundred signatures.⁵

Like many another observer of the American scene, Heinzen was alarmed by the large number of lawyers in the state legislatures and in the Congress of the United States. He observed that the American people were apparently more interested in oratory than in ideas and principles. He advocated abolishing the fee system for attorneys and suggested that they be paid, like judges, from the state treasury, as servants of the state. Until legal services could be furnished free, he favored a small fee from clients, to be paid to the state. Heinzen's antagonism to religion led him to oppose all legal oaths and to urge the substitution of simple punishments for dishonesty. He regarded judicial review of acts of legislation as an undemocratic procedure and the power of judges to punish for contempt of court as arbitrary and dangerous to liberty. He wrote frequently about the "half-religious nimbus" that surrounded the black robes of the judiciary. His disgust with the outcome of the Tweed Ring prosecution in New York led to a demand for drastic modifications in the jury system. He believed none should be excused from jury duty except for illness but that the time of service should be reduced in order to get better men. He objected to the disqualifying of prospective jurors simply because they had informed themselves on the case before they were summoned and perhaps had formed a preliminary judgment, and he sought to abolish the principle of unanimous decisions and to substitute the usual democratic procedure of majority vote. Heinzen also favored the employment of a public defender at public expense.

The recall was another device which intrigued the radical publisher of the *Pionier*. He considered it an essential of the democratic process, and he would apply it to all office-holders

⁵ See *Freidenker*, December 20, 1885; *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*, January 31, 1886.

in every department of the government and to legislative acts. It was Heinzen's contention that the people, by majority vote, must have the power to instruct and recall, as well as to elect, their public servants. He did not expect the recall to be used often, and he would require a petition by one-third of the voters to make it mandatory. He also suggested the choice of three trustees at each election, to serve as unpaid, honest servants of the people, to watch all office-holders and to recommend new elections when they found them delinquent in their duties.

Although the proposal appealed strongly to many of his contemporaries, Heinzen regarded proportional representation as an impractical and undemocratic device. He rejected it even though he was aware of the benefits a radical minority would derive from its adoption. Since the minority in America was guaranteed the right to agitate, by word and deed, against any measure of which it disapproved, Heinzen adhered to his principle of majority rule and opposed any special privileges for a minority group. In a true democracy the majority must rule, he thought, and Heinzen had no desire to interfere with its ability to carry out its decisions by encouraging splits in the parties because of proportional representation. Heinzen opposed representation by economic or occupational groups on the same ground, namely, that it would complicate the democratic process and nourish class hatreds.

The tremendous changes initiated by the economic revolution in the period following the Civil War impressed Heinzen with the need to protect American democracy against the growing pressures of privileged interests and economic power groups. He saw the Republican party change in his lifetime, under the impact of the new industrial capitalism, into a party which harbored monopolists, speculators, privileged bankers, high-tariff advocates, railroad magnates, and the moneyed aristocracy of his day. The party seemed to be following a policy of pure opportunism and *laissez faire*, with little thought

for the humanitarian motives that had led to its rise or for the interests of the common people.

Heinzen disapproved of reductions in the graduated income tax after the war, because he detected in these proposals the first signs of the coming rule of the rich. He watched the mounting agitation for a protective tariff with particular alarm. He favored a new tax on the unearned increment of land. He was disturbed by the rapidly developing railroad monopolies and by the methods of high finance used in building them, and he opposed the investment of huge amounts of foreign capital in the American transportation systems. Occasionally, he wrote editorials favoring a limit on the amount of wealth any individual might acquire and advocating the exclusion of the wealthy from the state legislatures and from Congress. Curiously enough, he would have approved a transfer of the United States mails to private companies, apparently because he thought this would result in more economical administration and less political patronage.

Heinzen's plan for municipal reform included the abolition of the mayor and the two-chamber city council. He wanted councilmen to be elected by districts without residence requirements. Administrative officers, in turn, would be chosen by the council from among the citizens. Those selected were to constitute an executive commission and serve as heads of the various departments. All tax ordinances were to be submitted to a plebiscite. It should be added that Heinzen was particularly disappointed by the failure of American cities, in contrast with European, to provide proper recreational and park facilities for their people. He made a special appeal to preserve intact the Public Garden of Boston and worked out detailed plans for a park system for New York.

When the editor of the *Pionier* turned to the discussion of the tariff and the currency, he betrayed considerable uncertainty in these complicated fields of economic theory. Heinzen was

skeptical about protecting "infant industries" lest they grow into lusty monopolies. He denounced mercantilism as the nefarious result of nationalism and despotism, but he also rejected free trade, believing that the circumstances prevailing in each country at a particular time must qualify the application of a theory which he believed was essentially sound. He lauded the German *Zollverein*, and he favored a Continental system to destroy England's monopoly in trade and industry and to drive her people back to agriculture, thus breaking up her landed aristocracy. Heinzen favored a protective tariff for the United States as a defensive measure, but he was opposed to protection as a permanent peacetime policy. He objected to efforts to create new industries artificially for which the nation had neither labor, natural resources, nor home market and in the same breath argued that the United States must be self-sufficient. Thus, like most Americans of his time and since, Heinzen vacillated between free trade and protection and never quite succeeded in clarifying his own thinking on this highly complicated problem.

The question of fiat money, whether in the guise of greenbacks or free silver, had Heinzen swimming beyond his depth. He announced that he knew nothing about finance, but he discussed the currency problem as though he thought he did. He concluded that the gold standard was "imaginary." He believed the state could create money if its word were as good as its gold, and he was intrigued by the possibilities of a universally recognized international currency. He cited the notes of the Bank of England as evidence of what might be accomplished by a good reputation, and he hoped the United States would take the lead away from England by pledging its entire national wealth as security for a billion dollars in notes, which would be accepted at face value at home and abroad. He believed such a plan would end the whole controversy over resumption of specie payment which exercised a whole generation after the Civil War. Heinzen had no fear of inflation because he expected

the government to control the amounts of paper issued; he wanted such paper made legal tender even in payment of tariffs; and he waxed eloquent about ending the "tyranny of gold by the democracy of paper." At the same time he praised Schurz's speeches in defense of sound money and insisted that the *Pionier* had always taken the same position. His naïve solution for the free-silver controversy was a proposal to increase the weight of the silver dollar to equal that of the gold dollar. Heinzen wrote noble but vague editorials about using money solely to compensate men for actual work done rather than for speculative profits on capital and about transforming it into an agency of the spirit, to encourage art, literature, science, and good taste rather than to perpetuate a "dollar civilization" in which all the money got into the hands of the "wrong people."

Though Heinzen expressed himself vigorously about the spoils system, he never became the ardent civil service reformer one might have expected him to be. He would have prohibited office-holding to all editors and newspaper publishers, and he would have barred all paid government printing or advertising from the press. He credited President Hayes with making an honest effort to introduce civil service into the federal government, but he believed the American educational system, unlike the Prussian, did not properly prepare men for government posts. He favored provisional appointments and guaranties against unjustified removals from office, but he was so absorbed by his fight to abolish the presidency as the main source of political patronage that civil service reform received relatively little attention.

Heinzen's passion for reform led him to explore various related questions, such as penology, medicine, and educational theory, because he believed them vital to the body politic. His proposals for penal reform rested on two basic assumptions, namely, that society is responsible for most of the offenses committed against it and that the purpose of punishment is not revenge but a desire to make the criminal temporarily harmless

until he can be reformed. He traced the idea of revenge straight back to theological origins. Crime itself he explained on the basis of lack of freedom, lack of the proper means of existence, and lack of education—three deficiencies which Heinzen believed it was the business of the state to correct. Truth and justice, he maintained, are independent of love or hate, persons or circumstances, and, in dealing with those who have offended against society, justice must take the place of affection and guarantee equal rights even to those whom men hate. Heinzen was especially incensed by the Pennsylvania penal system which kept prisoners in solitude, and he advocated the abolition of all solitary confinement. Moreover, he favored paying prisoners for their work, one half their earnings to go to their families, the other half to be held for them until their release.⁶ The movement for reform in the treatment of the insane also enlisted Heinzen's enthusiastic support, and he joined with Wendell Phillips, Dr. Zakrzewska, and others in forcing the question upon the attention of the Massachusetts legislature.

Heinzen had positive and somewhat peculiar views on medicine. In advance of his time, he stressed the importance of proper diet as an important factor in public health and preventive medicine, and he tried hard to awaken the medical profession to an interest in this question by occasionally publishing complete diet lists in the *Pionier* and inviting discussions of this important matter. Heinzen's own contribution usually consisted of the addition of more substantial items from German kitchens, like spareribs and sauerkraut, pork and cabbage, and *Sauerbraten* and red cabbage, to the rather anemic American diet lists. The *Pionier* published many articles on the heart, the blood, and other physiological and anatomical subjects. It devoted much space to the exposure of medical quackery, and Heinzen deplored the fact that doctors, by using Latin, tried to keep their profession as mysterious as the priesthood. The *Pionier* exposed

⁶ See the lecture "Ueber die 'Bruderliebe'" (Philadelphia, 1852), in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (n.p., 1867).

fraudulent advertisements of miraculous mechanical therapeutic devices, "electrogalvany," "vibratory preventives," "Ladies Silver Pills," and other nostrums with which publications like *The Celestial Intelligencer and Medical Cabinet* and *The Prophylactic Star* of Albany exploited the gullible public. Heinzen was especially interested in exposing the advertisements by which our otherwise somewhat prudish forebears were informed, in not too subtle language, how conception might be prevented and abortions induced. Heinzen occasionally discussed birth control and Malthusianism, but he accepted family limitation only as a last resort. He still believed that social reforms would be better than "medicinal prevention," and he denounced the stupidity of his countrymen in resorting to stupid German "doctors" instead of going to scientifically trained M.D.'s.

Heinzen had a profound reverence for true medicine, which he defined as "Nature transformed into art or scientific skill." He regarded surgery, obstetrics, and diet as the most scientific aspects of the medical profession, and he was quite unsettled by the many controversies that raged in the field of internal medicine and by the tendency to respect the swindler, who gives the most medicine, more highly than the scientific practitioner. He wrote special editorials in praise of pioneer women doctors.

In spite of his insistence on science and truth in medical practice, Heinzen rejected vaccination, on the ground that it poisoned the human body with an animal poison. He wrote diatribes against smoking and beer-drinking but thought the moderate use of wine was beneficial. He attended spiritualist séances in order to expose spirit-rapping, and the Washington *Tafelrunde* charged that Heinzen himself was once a spiritualist. Near the close of his life he wrote in favor of euthanasia and defined the rules that should govern its use.

Heinzen gave major attention to phrenology, which enjoyed great popularity in his day, and the significance of which he nev-

er could entirely understand. Horace Mann, Emerson, Whitman, and President Quincy of Harvard were interested in it, and phrenological societies, magazines, and practitioners gave abundant evidence of the popularity of the new doctrine which seemed to fit into the scientific technique of the times by removing the processes of the mind from the philosophical and metaphysical realm and reducing them to a materialistic basis.⁷ Heinzen thought that phrenology was neither a humbug nor a science. He believed it rested upon certain still vague and unproved hypotheses that needed more investigation, and he threw open the columns of the *Pionier* to scientific discussions of the subject. He himself wrote some clever satire on the more extravagant claims of phrenology, but he also carried on an extended and serious correspondence with many people who believed in this new approach to the problem of human behavior. Heinzen was deeply interested in the structure of the brain and the nervous system, and he ventured the suggestion that phrenology might prove a great aid to education in determining what individual pupils should be taught.

Heinzen's tests for the educational system of the radical democratic state may be summed up under the three terms "truth," "utility," and "beauty" and the further requirement that all schools must teach true republicanism. Because of the contribution it would make to equal rights for women, Heinzen favored coeducation, except between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. During this period, and for purely physiological reasons, he favored reducing the amount of mental effort for girls, several days' rest each month, and a greater emphasis on physical education. With his co-worker on the *Pionier*, Dr. Adolf Douai, Heinzen was one of the founders of the first kindergarten in Boston. It was established as an adjunct to the German-English school which he also helped to support.⁸ Heinzen, who was ex-

⁷ See Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought* (New York, 1943), pp. 341-43.

⁸ *Der Deutsche Pionier* (Cincinnati), XV, 72.

tremely sensitive to all kinds of physical suffering, stressed teaching little children kindness to animals, that they might learn to pity the weak and the defenseless.⁹ He favored a national system of public education and federal grants-in-aid to states and local communities. He advocated the establishment of several genuine universities by Congress, one to be German, and to its professorships he wanted to call scientists and materialist philosophers like Virchow, Büchner, Moleschott, Vogt, and Ruge. He gave of his meager funds to found a German teachers' seminary and to the German school dedicated in Boston in 1868, and he interested himself personally in the task of finding properly qualified teachers for the German schools in Milwaukee and Detroit. He approved of the high scholastic standards of German Gymnasiums and universities, but he denounced many features of their student life, particularly dueling and excessive drinking. A lover of the classics and a great admirer of Hellenic civilization, he favored the teaching of Latin and Greek and the history and literature of the ancients in translation, for here he found one of the wellsprings for his love of art and his interest in speculative thinking. When the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was established, the *Pionier* commented with satisfaction that hereafter it would be unnecessary to go to Europe to get a technical education.

Though Heinzen believed in free public schools, he vigorously opposed compulsory attendance, and over this subject he waged many a battle with some of his best friends. Just as he had upheld the right of Catholics to complain about compulsory reading of the Bible in the public schools, so he argued that to compel school attendance violated the freedom of parents and constituted coercion by the state. If the state could coerce at this point, what would prevent similar dictation in the entire realm of family relationship? "Public education," Heinzen wrote, "is a function of the state, not a tyranny." In Prussia,

⁹ This was an old theme with Heinzen (see his excellent articles on "Thierquälerei in Köln," in *Rheinisches Volksblatt*, February 12 and 13, 1841).

children were to be educated into dutiful subjects of altar and throne; in a free America, compulsion of any kind would be an anomaly.

Heinzen believed that the schools could be made so attractive that children would wish to attend them. He was ready to have the state furnish free books, clothing, and other aids to the children of the poor, and he would have the state insure clean and wholesome homes for all children to live in and even indemnify needy parents for the loss of earnings while their offspring were in school. He advocated attractive school buildings, decorated with pictures and busts of the great leaders of mankind, in order to develop the aesthetic and moral sense of the pupils. The Harvard buildings, he thought, looked like barracks or warehouses. He wanted good teachers to be paid adequately, and he favored the inclusion of geography, world history, and nature study in the curriculum of the elementary schools. Education was a matter of independent thinking, not learning by drill and rote. In spite of his interest in science, Heinzen believed scientific and technical training received too much emphasis in the schools, to the disadvantage or total exclusion of aesthetics, justice, and moral duty. He wanted natural science and nature study to serve as the tools for critical thinking and as an antidote for religion, but he did not favor too much emphasis upon the practical and vocational. He considered fairy tales as destructive to a child's development as religious fables. Finally, he believed the Declaration of Independence should be the foundation for the entire structure of American education, in order that children might learn the doctrines of liberty, democracy, and equal rights from the very beginning of the educational process.¹⁰

In spite of his constant insistence upon the realities of life, Heinzen could not refrain from occasional utopian dreams. One

¹⁰ See *Pionier*, February 26, 1874. On compulsory attendance see *ibid.*, October 8, 1872, and the controversy between Heinzen and a fellow-editor, reported in *Atlantis* (N.S.), V (December, 1856), 461-65.

of these fantasies, published in the *Pionier* in 1865, pictured New York City of A.D. 3000. It reveals, to a striking degree, what the "good life" meant to Heinzen. New York, by the year 3000, had become a city of beauty and learning. Central Park was surrounded by magnificent Greek temples, one dedicated to truth, another to justice, a third to art. Each temple had its appropriate exhibits, and lectures were held there every morning. The Temple of Love was consecrated to the institution of civil marriage. Here men and women, by merely recording their names on tablets, gave notice to the rest of the world that they intended to live together as man and wife. At the other end of the temple there were similar tablets to make divorce easy by simple entries of the fact that love had vanished. In the Temple of Death lectures were given to dispel man's fear of the final mystery of life. Each morning, in appropriate auditoriums, lectures were delivered, by the best authorities, on natural science, hygiene, and medicine. In the afternoons everybody strolled through beautiful parks with opportunities for wholesome recreation, excellent restaurants to restore the inner man, and the world's best music resounding from every hill. Each evening would be spent at the public theater. In this Greek, pagan utopia there were neither police nor preachers.

All that Heinzen said or wrote about reform was predicated on the assumption that women must benefit equally thereby. He demanded the immediate and complete emancipation of women. His extreme abolitionism had lost him many friends among the Germans, but his stand on equal rights for women lost him even more. German-Americans then, and for many years after, were unrelenting opponents of equal suffrage, for they believed woman's place was in the home (*Kinder, Küche, Kirche*). Relatively few men, German or otherwise, were willing in the second half of the last century to accept Heinzen's dictum that women are, and must be recognized as, the equals of men in status, rights, privileges, and potentialities.

In the *Deutsche Schnellpost* and the *Janus* Heinzen had cham-

pioned the rights of women and had complimented the few German women, like Mathilde Franziska Anneke, publisher of the Milwaukee *Frauenzeitung*, Mathilde F. Wendt, and Marie Blöde, who dared to challenge the special privileges of the German male.¹¹ Heinzen paid his respects to pioneers like Fanny Wright and Ernestine Rose and in some years stressed woman's suffrage in nearly every issue of the *Pionier*. In 1856 Heinzen attended a women's-rights convention in New York in order to hear Lucy Stone. Three years later, at a similar meeting in Boston, he heard Wendell Phillips for the first time and was tremendously impressed with the quality of his oratory. At gatherings of this kind Heinzen discovered how superior American women were to their German sisters in the intelligent discussion of the issues involved.

The *Pionier* advertised every new woman's publication that appeared. The *Woman's Journal* interested Heinzen particularly, because it was sponsored by his friends, Mary L. Booth and Dr. Zakrzewska. The *Pionier* fought endless battles with papers like the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* and the New York *Kriminalzeitung* over the issue of equal rights and received support only from such relatively unimportant papers as the Indianapolis *Freie Presse*, the St. Louis *Neue Welt*, and the Peoria *Deutsche Zeitung*. Heinzen printed and circulated petitions for woman's suffrage from his Boston office. He deplored the fact that certain suffrage leaders were too closely affiliated with the temperance movement, and too many ministers attended their conventions, but he announced that he would support the movement even if it increased the power of the church, and if he knew that not another drop of wine or beer would reach the lips of any man again. Woman's suffrage became for Heinzen an acid test of democracy.

¹¹ See Henriette M. Heinzen, in collaboration with Hertha Anneke Sanne, "Biographical Notes in Commemoration of Fritz Anneke and Mathilde Franziska Anneke" (manuscript vols.; Madison, Wis., 1940), pp. 252, 258-59. See also A. B. Faust, "Mathilde Franziska Giesler Anneke," *German-American Annals* (N.S.), XVI, 73 ff.

Heinzen's argument for woman's suffrage began with the Declaration of Independence. "All men are created equal," in the generic sense, and he denied that there were differences, "fixed by nature," between either the races or the sexes. Why should men regard the practical difficulties connected with the emancipation of women greater than those involved in freeing the colored man? Heinzen insisted that the real issue was not the emancipation of women but of human beings who happen to be women. When his opponents objected that women could not defend the state in war, he replied that the crippled and the infirm are exempted from military service without losing their rights as citizens; and to the argument that it was women's duty to become mothers, he countered that suffrage would not interfere with the exercise of their maternal instincts and that men did not sacrifice their political privileges by remaining bachelors. He had no patience with those who would keep women in the kitchen or who demanded a special period of training for the franchise, when no similar requirements were imposed on men. Public life, Heinzen maintained, consisted of the sum total of all individual lives, and those who make up the human family must constitute the state.¹²

Few German-Americans took any interest in the equal-rights' movement except to ridicule and to oppose it. No other people have written more sentimentally about their women than the Germans, but Heinzen concluded that nowhere among civilized nations were women treated with more indifference and less respect than in Germany. He found the reasons in the influence of the royal courts, Junker and feudal survivals, life in the German army, and the degeneracy of the students in German universities. He believed the army and the universities were the "high schools of prostitution" for the degradation of womanhood in the fatherland. The officer class was judged by

¹² See *Pionier*, February 3, 1856, and *Editoren-Kongress* (Boston, 1872), pp. 374-418. Heinzen frequently wrote on the question of women's rights under the pseudonyms "Luise Meyen" and "Julie vom Berg."

the number of medals acquired and by the number of women betrayed, compulsory military service corrupted the soldiers, disseminated "urban culture" among the peasants, and sent the recruits back to their communities completely ruined. One of the arguments Heinzen made against the war system was that it lowered the moral tone of society and, particularly, enslaved the women.

As a corollary to his advocacy of equal right for women, Heinzen could not avoid discussing love and marriage. Here he wrote with complete frankness, in a style that would excite little attention today. During the last century, however, any frank, scientific discussion of questions related to sex was likely to lead to charges of "free love," and the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* and other conservative organs promptly labeled the courageous editor of the *Pionier* as a "free lover."

Heinzen started with the hypothesis that marriages for convenience and for economic reasons were not marriages at all. He held that women must have the same rights as men in seeking a life-mate, including the right to invite men to dances, call on them in their homes, and initiate proposals of marriage, if they wished to do so. "Passion without love," he wrote, "is coarseness; love without passion is fantasy; love with passion is a harmonious blending of truth and beauty." "No woman is truly beautiful who is only beautiful, and no woman is truly ugly who has spirit and soul."¹³ Heinzen contended that true love was not dependent solely on physical charm and might endure long after physical beauty had faded. He argued that man was as capable of pure and constant devotion as woman and that this would become increasingly apparent as the status of woman was raised. Only then could there be a genuine blending of the lives of equals, and woman would no longer be degraded as a mere possession of man. Marriage must be based on complete freedom of choice, and it must end when love dies, with equal free-

¹³ See his lecture delivered in Louisville in 1854 before a club of "freethinking women," "Ueber die 'Liebe,'" in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (1867).

dom granted both parties to dissolve the union. Heinzen would have removed all church restrictions on divorce and made it easy to obtain, provided always that the parents or the state protected the interests of the children, and he set forth in detail just what those obligations were and how they must be met.

The malicious charges of his enemies notwithstanding, Heinzen utterly repudiated "free love." He thought genuine marriages, for the purpose of "procreation, love, and friendship" would endure. In a sharp but good-natured exchange with the editor of the *Katholische Kirchenzeitung*, he defended the principle of *conservatio delectat* and the integrity of the family against the *variatio delectat* of legalized or illegal prostitution. He denounced in equal terms the "passive prostitution of women held in bondage by unhappy marriages" and the more "active prostitution" paid for by men.

Heinzen's best-known contribution to this phase of the subject was a monograph of 173 pages, entitled *The Rights of Women and the Sexual Relations*. It was translated ten years after his death by Emma Heller Schumm and published in 1891 by a fellow Boston radical, Benjamin R. Tucker. The essay was a learned and noble argument to end the "age of slavery and suffering" for women. Heinzen deplored the prevailing sex interpretation of history and regretted his inability to write the story of woman's part in human evolution, but he presented an excellent, if brief, historical review of the role of women from antiquity to the present. "Men have made the rights, men have made the morals, men have made the duties, men have made the laws," he wrote, and "they have taken good care that woman should be excluded as much as possible from everything." In his search for "the ethical rules" by which the sex instinct might be satisfied "without involving degeneration," he described the beauty of monogamy and family life, as "the foundation of the most beautiful, the truest, and the surest human happiness." The family, Heinzen reiterated many times, "is inconceivable without real marriage, and real marriage is inconceiv-

able without love, and love can no longer be distinguished from prostitution when the free bond of union is vitiated by compulsion." If civil marriage be substituted for clerical sanctions and the state guarantee women the opportunities to acquire economic independence and an education equal to that of men, ideal unions would be possible, based on deep moral obligations and a sense of beauty, and without that "double standard" which made it a disgrace for a man to cheat a man but a triumph to deceive a woman.

Radicalism, it will be seen, included a well-integrated program of many reforms. Heinzen relied for the dissemination of his ideas, first of all, upon the *Pionier*. He was proud of its relatively small but select constituency. Next, Heinzen probably would have stressed his lectures, though they never attracted sizable audiences and were usually reprinted in the *Pionier* or in pamphlet form. But the organizations on which he counted most were the Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles and the League of Radicals (Bund der Radikalen).

The first of these two organizations, of which Heinzen was the creator and guiding spirit, was founded in 1865 and within three months boasted four hundred members scattered throughout the United States. It had already begun to publish and sell, in convenient, cheap editions, the literature of radicalism as it flowed from the pen of its archchampion in Boston and several of his satellites in other cities. In 1866 the society advertised Heinzen's collected essays on *German Radicalism in America* at a cost of two dollars. The resources of the organization never exceeded a thousand dollars a year, but with that small sum it maintained an amazingly vigorous program of publication. Heinzen was president of the society and worked hard to establish new units of the organization throughout the country. Some of the society's pamphlets were circulated in Germany, in cheap editions that might escape the watchful eye of the censors, and contributions to its treasury came occasionally from far-off places in Europe and South America. Several years before

Heinzen's death, the group was torn apart by a violent controversy over communism. Its treasurer defaulted on eight hundred dollars of the society's money, but efforts continued to be made, after Heinzen's death, by Dr. Zakrzewska and others, to enrol new members and to continue the program of publication.

In the meantime the League of Radicals had been launched as a national society. Its headquarters presently were transferred from New York to Milwaukee, where Mme Anneke took a lively interest in the enterprise. The executive committee included prominent radicals, representatives of the Turner movement and the freethinking societies, and a few German women bold enough to express interest in the radical cause. Three thousand copies of the program of the society were distributed in Wisconsin alone in an effort to enlist the support of the Grangers, who, among other reforms, also championed equal rights for women. The League pushed Heinzen's pet proposal to abolish the presidency, and, in 1876, radical clubs were formed in a number of cities in preparation for a national convention to be held in Philadelphia in connection with the Centennial Exposition. On several occasions the organization of the *Freie Gemeinde* was on the point of joining the League, but the *Turnerbund* refused to affiliate.

The League of Radicals gathered in convention in Philadelphia on June 28, 1876, for a three-day session. Delegates came from the free congregations and freethinking societies, from some of the *Turnvereine*, from the Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles, and from several other minor groups, including a smattering of Socialists and Communists. Heinzen dominated the proceedings, aided by some of his most faithful followers, such as Schmemann of Detroit, Lieber of Indianapolis, and Schroeter of Sauk City. There were six women delegates present, and Robert Reitzel acted as one of the secretaries. The five Communists who attended were granted a hearing, but the platform, adopted after long and sharp debate, was essentially a Heinzen product and had been outlined earlier in

the *Pionier*. The League rejected all "palliatives" and demanded "radical remedies" "to preserve the life of the Republic" and to make the United States a model for the world.

At the close of the convention, Heinzen delivered a lecture on "What Do the Germans Want and What Should They Do in America" to a packed house. There followed a convivial evening at the hall of the *Freie Gemeinde* of Philadelphia, which was celebrating its silver jubilee. Heinzen was fired with enthusiasm for his third attempt at launching a new party, and, as usual, he had presented it with a ready-made platform. His first attempt had been made in Louisville in 1854; his second, at the Cleveland Radical Convention of 1864; and now he had launched a third, in Philadelphia, the cradle of American independence, at the psychological moment when the people were celebrating the centenary of the document which was the basis of their whole national life. Heinzen stayed on in Philadelphia for several days to attend a session of the convention of the Liberal League and to visit the exposition. Here he was fascinated by the magic of the machines on exhibit and infuriated by the Prussian display of Krupp cannon and likenesses of the Kaiser and Bismarck. He contrasted these signs of German culture with the bust of Voltaire, the only figure on display in the French exhibit.

Heinzen returned to his editorial duties in Boston, resentful that so little notice was taken of his convention. Almost immediately he began a controversy over the election as secretary of the League of a former colleague, von Ende, who had edited the *Pionier* while its editor was in Europe. He accused him of being a Communist in disguise and of having the support of a Communist group in Milwaukee. The fight became furious and personal and provoked similar battles in the various locals affiliated with the League so that the work of the Philadelphia convention was seriously jeopardized by factional quarrels. Reitzel defended von Ende; Heinzen announced that no Communist could hide behind his platform; secessions from the central organiza-

tion followed; and presently the principles of the movement were completely lost sight of because of an unseemly quarrel over the meaning of several minor passages in the platform to which Heinzen attached far more importance than they deserved. Having at last forced the secretary to resign, the *Pionier* continued for many months to print reams about the controversy over communism, but Heinzen pleaded for a speedy reconciliation among the warring factions.

The last convention of the League of Radicals was held in Philadelphia in 1879. Heinzen attended, leaving George Schumm in Boston to edit the *Pionier* during his absence. There were no more than twenty delegates present. Karl Schmemann presided, and Heinzen made the opening address, a historical review of the radical movement. He became ill during the sessions and could not attend several of them, and, because of increasing deafness, he found it impossible adequately to report the proceedings. His own followers were outvoted by the Milwaukee group, which insisted on some changes in the platform. Heinzen refused membership on the platform committee, and the *Philadelphia Tageblatt* joyously heralded the end of the Boston "papacy."

The changes in the platform to which Heinzen objected seem unimportant enough, but they provoked the old feud about communism. One proposal favored proportional representation and compulsory school attendance, both of which had been repeatedly attacked in the *Pionier*. Others were minor changes dealing with matters of organization, public lands, postal savings banks, and public operation and ownership of the railroads. Heinzen did not object to these demands in principle, but he argued vigorously that they were not specific enough.

Heinzen left Philadelphia with Louis Prang for a final vacation in Germania, Pennsylvania. Nature's beauties and the reunion with old friends temporarily improved his failing health, but shortly after his return to Boston he became incapacitated for further work. He reflected dolefully on the decline of the

spirit of the "Forty-eighters" in America and wondered who would carry the torch of German radicalism after he and his generation were gone. His only hope lay in converting Americans to his principles, and again he lamented the fact that he had such a poor command of English. He did not retreat, however, from any of the advanced positions he had taken on scores of political, economic, and social questions during a lifetime of public controversy. It never occurred to him that a political and social program like his, devised a priori, and without traditions or experiences to support it, could not compete with the older American parties. Heinzen always was long on theory and short on practical application, and much of his thinking was done in a political vacuum.

CHAPTER TEN

SOCIAL REFORM WITHOUT COMMUNISM

THOUGHTFUL AMERICANS OF THE CIVIL WAR and Reconstruction period who loved their fellow-men and had enough intelligence to sense the forces operating around them could hardly fail to notice that the economic revolution was affecting profoundly every phase of American life and not always for the better. Scientific invention and large-scale production raised the general standard of living, but that substantial equality of opportunity which had elicited the enthusiastic comment of so many European observers of the American scene before 1850 seemed to be yielding slowly to a new era of contrasts. Colossal fortunes and dire poverty, the millionaire and the homeless tramp, were common products of the new industrialism. The era of cotton capitalism was transformed into an era of industrial and finance capitalism. Free lands and the frontier of the pioneers were coming to an end, and, with the closing of these safety valves, life in the United States became more like that of Europe. The factory system, driven as an entering wedge into the American social structure, reduced the relations between employer and employee to a more impersonal basis. The unequal bargaining power between workers and corporations; the stratification of society due to the rise of big business and the formation of labor unions; the conflict between capitalists and workers; intricate economic questions precipitated into the arena of public debate and the ballot box; the emergence of all

those problems which are the results of "class struggle," were the inevitable consequences of the transformation of American life from a primarily agricultural to a dominantly industrial pattern. In the long run this economic revolution proved far more important than the dramatic struggles over slavery and abolition, union and secession, and presidential or military reconstruction of the South. Heinzen was not particularly at home in the complicated questions of economic theory which underlay the public controversies of the last decade and a half of his life. He was keenly aware of the issues, however, and he was deeply concerned with the necessity of preserving equal economic opportunity as the indispensable foundation for political democracy. His intelligence and his deep human sympathy were aroused to action, and the files of the *Pionier*, during the later years of its existence, reveal the paramount importance which the editor attached to a frank and courageous discussion of these issues.

Heinzen wrote much about land and labor and about socialism, communism, and related problems. In fact, he wrote so much on these subjects that for years after his death his friends and enemies quarreled as to the proper category of economic reformers to which he should be assigned. Some argued that he was an anarchist—an utterly false assumption in spite of his frequent references to Proudhon. Others maintained, with more truth, that he was a Socialist. One thing is certain—he was not a Communist!

Immigrants, and especially the Germans who played such an important role in the winning of the Mississippi Valley for agriculture, were in almost unanimous agreement that the government should make the public domain available to actual settlers without cost. The Republican party's sponsorship of the homestead system proved to be one of the major attractions for the German vote in 1860, and the slogan "Vote Yourself a Farm" probably was more effective than "Bleeding Kansas" in winning immigrants for the party of free soil and free farms.

Southern Democrats in Congress repeatedly blocked the passage of the Homestead Act until after the Civil War had begun, for "the Homestead bill," lamented the *Charleston Mercury* of March 17, 1860, "is a grand scheme to settle the Northwest and create new States. . . . It is the most dangerous abolition bill which has ever been directly pressed in Congress." Southerners fiercely opposed "land for the landless" and viewed the proposal as nothing but a subtle device to consummate "a sectional despotism of the North over the South" and an election bribe to win the Irish and the "Dutch."

Heinzen had advocated homestead legislation from the beginning of his journalistic career in the United States in the early fifties. He saw clearly why the South and the Democrats opposed the proposal. He not only wanted free farms for the workers but government help for those who needed it in order to begin farming. He believed a homestead act would provide relief for the congested tenement areas of eastern cities and give new encouragement to the westward movement. To his tirades against the Democratic party and southern slaveholders for degrading the black worker, he added the charge that they were intent on denying white workers all opportunity to improve their lot in life. After the homestead policy became a reality, Heinzen was among the first to see how it was being abused by speculators in order to build up vast holdings out of what had been the public domain. Heinzen was equally disturbed by the huge land grants Congress made to the railroads in the period after the Civil War, and he criticized the Republican leadership for wasting the heritage of the people. He proposed that all land be owned by the government and rented to private individuals, at perhaps fifty cents an acre, with the proviso that if the renter died intestate, his holding would revert to the state. In 1877 Heinzen published his complete program of land reform in the *Pionier*. It was formally approved by the League of Radicals, who urged its adoption in petitions addressed to Congress. In addition to a demand to stop all further sales and gifts of land, it was proposed

that each homesteader pay rent on an eighty-acre farm or less, beginning three years after occupation, and that the government loan the rent to those who could not pay. A large area was to be reserved for roads and parks and other public uses, and the government was requested to buy back all land which had been sold or granted and was not in actual use.

In the field of labor relations, Heinzen demanded radical reforms. Like Wendell Phillips, he saw that, now that abolition had been achieved, the next reforms must be directed toward improving the social and economic structure of the United States, particularly through a drastic program to improve the opportunities of the toiling masses. Immediately after the close of the Civil War the *Pionier* championed state legislation to establish the eight-hour day. Heinzen was prepared to reject laissez faire at a time when it was still the mainspring of the American economic structure and had the support not only of capitalists and employers but of many workers who hoped to draw a lucky card some day from the pack of fortune and rise by free enterprise to higher economic and social levels. Heinzen believed that, in addition to keeping order and exercising the police power, the state should promote the general welfare by helping men, through positive legislative enactment, to realize their potentialities to the fullest possible degree. He did not think that social legislation would destroy individual self-help. On the contrary, he insisted that it was only by state intervention, to provide and safeguard equal opportunity, that self-help was possible.

The *Pionier* thundered against big dividends and low wages. It advocated action by the state to enable the workers to become their own employers by making credit available on easy terms from the public treasury. Heinzen approved heartily of the co-operative movement as a device which helped workers to become capitalist owners. Only under such a system could genuine competition of industry and talent be established and individual initiative preserved. The evils of long hours and child

and female labor, the lack of proper sanitation facilities and inspection of factories, and existing inequalities in the educational advantages available to workers all seemed to demand state intervention and regulation. Heinzen favored public works for the unemployed if no other means could be found to guarantee them a living. He pleaded with the workers to realize their potential strength, to become statesmen in politics, to abandon the selfish, restricted class interests which dominated most of the workers' congresses of the 1860's and 1870's, and to adopt political weapons as the sure means for their salvation. Because workers obviously were the majority in every state, Heinzen saw no need for any organization except a political one in which all could unite in support of a common program of social reform. A mere increase in wages, or a narrow craft union, was not enough.

Heinzen belonged to the white-collar intellectuals, but, like many others of that class, he was a genuine friend of the workingman. He regarded W. H. Sylvis, president of the National Labor Union, as one of the real statesmen of his time. He was not convinced about the merit of strikes. It is true that in 1872 Heinzen indorsed a strike in New York for the eight-hour day and expressed the hope that it might spread throughout the United States, but this was a fundamental demand which he re-regarded as a simple matter of justice and humanity. On the other hand, he frequently discussed the "war chests" and strike funds collected by unions for use in walkouts or lockouts and suggested that if these sums were carefully husbanded, and groups of workers pooled their savings, they would be adequate to lift employees into the capitalist class or to launch co-operatives which would crowd the "bourgeois" from the field. He favored legislation to limit the profits on capital by awarding the capitalists full compensation for their risks but distributing the rest under a profit-sharing plan.

The year 1877 witnessed an epidemic of railroad strikes in the United States which was so serious and violent that many

thoughtful Americans became aware, for the first time, of the inequities which had crept into American industrial society; and some were sufficiently alarmed to contemplate the possibilities of social revolution and barricades in the major cities of the land. The *North American Review* blamed German socialism for "the caravan of the discontented." The *Pionier* examined the causes of the strikes of 1877 and condemned the railroad companies for unjustifiable reductions in wages while continuing to pay undiminished dividends to their shareholders. But it also condemned the excesses of the strikers. Curiously enough, Heinzen still was unwilling to advocate public ownership of the nation's transportation system, apparently because he thought that this would lead to a multiplication of employees beyond the legitimate needs of the industry and that these workers would vote for the president in power. Heinzen agreed with the organ of the Workers' party of the United States that what the workers needed was "more bread, more knowledge and more freedom."¹ He understood the significance of free lands and the frontier in American civilization, and he knew that "the West" had saved the United States from the proletarian problems of the Old World. He stood ready to battle for the rights of the workers as human beings in the same way as he had fought for the rights of the slave and as he continued to fight for the rights of women. But he would not approve of the "class struggle" or of a "craft" or "guild" system which ignored the political issues which he regarded as of paramount importance, such as clericalism, corruption, constitutional changes, and woman's rights.

As far as Heinzen was concerned, all battles were fought simply and solely for the rights of man, a broad term which included all humanity. "The workers have no rights which are not also the rights of all people who do not specifically belong to the so-called working class," he wrote as early as 1852. "Every activity which is directed toward the achievement of a reasonable

¹ *Vorbote* (Chicago), January 19, 1878.

end is work, and the more noble and altruistic the purpose, the more respect the worker and his work deserve." In short, working for a living did not differentiate man from the animals. What made the difference was doing something for others, for liberty, art, science, and invention. That alone made the man! It would be ridiculous, Heinzen added, to rate a blacksmith, no matter how good, higher than a Humboldt, Rousseau, Goethe, or Raphael.² He regarded the workers as part of the nation as a whole. Therefore, they should labor for the rights of humanity as a whole, for only if these rights were secure could the rights of the workers be also. He warned against a caste system of the spindle, the hammer, and the needle as earnestly as he warned his countrymen against the aristocracy of the moneybags. "Class rule" of any kind was as objectionable to Heinzen as the rule of princes or aristocrats.

Heinzen lived through two major panics and depressions in his lifetime—the crash of 1857 and the prolonged depression which continued from 1873 almost to the end of that decade. He was deeply moved by the sufferings of the unemployed, and his own business did not escape the blighting effects of the panic. In 1857 and in 1873 he argued that the government must provide work for the unemployed and must build hospitals to nurse the starving workers back to health and strength. He anticipated some of the methods of 1933 by advocating a work program for the unemployed even if it involved nothing better than cutting down trees, shoveling dirt, and cleaning the streets. He favored public soup kitchens to supplement civilian work relief. He had no fear that emergency measures of this kind would become permanent, for he had faith enough in the spirit of individual enterprise to believe that men would seek something better at the earliest opportunity. He blamed the state, not crop failures or other accidents of nature, for the sharp drop in the business cycle. He demanded work, not charity, and an end to

² See "Über die Arbeit und die Arbeiter," in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (n.p., 1867), pp. 175-78.

laissez faire. He denounced the police for breaking up the meetings of workingmen, and he pleaded for the right of Communist and bourgeois alike to assemble freely in order to voice their grievances. As far as the majority of the German-language press was concerned, the *Pionier*, as on so many other issues, was a lone voice crying in the wilderness. Some of the Turner and the New York *Freidenkerbund* joined in protesting against the violation of civil rights during the depression of 1873; the rest remained silent. When Heinzen demanded an extra levy on millionaires in order to provide bread for the poor, his critics accused him of importing European "paternalism" into a free America.

It is obvious from what has been said that Heinzen's views smacked of socialism. That conclusion he would willingly have accepted, at least in later life, provided always that his principles were sharply differentiated from communism. With the latter, he waged an endless, bitter battle—as violent as any he fought with churchmen or slaveholders. He lectured frequently on the subject, and the *Pionier* belabored the Communists *ad nauseam*. Heinzen's opposition to the Marxian gospel rested on deep and sincere convictions, which derived from the republican theories which he applied with rigorous logic to all the issues of his day. But there also was something peculiarly personal about Heinzen's quarrel with communism. He had come to hate the founder of communism as he hated few other men.

According to Heinzen's own account, he first met the future father of communism in Cologne, while Marx was editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, before it was suppressed, and Heinzen was an occasional contributor to the paper. The two spent many an evening over their bottles of Rhenish wine, and, if one may accept Heinzen's account, the latter occasionally had to take his friend home in a somewhat inebriated condition and in a highly quarrelsome mood. Heinzen and Marx addressed each other with the familiar "du." Heinzen was amused by his friend's

absent-mindedness but apparently respected his ability and was convinced, at that time, of his sincere devotion to the liberal cause. After the suppression of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, Marx went to Paris with Ruge, who employed him as associate editor of his *Jahrbücher*, until both found it advisable to shake the dust of France from their shoes. Heinzen insisted that Marx learned his communism in Paris and developed it some years later in England. Schurz, who also knew Marx during these years, described him as "insufferably arrogant" and intolerant. Heinzen and Marx met again in Brussels, after the former had fled to Belgium to escape prosecution at the hands of the Prussian authorities for his book on bureaucracy. The two men argued heatedly over politics and economics, much to the discomfort and disgust of their mutual friend, Freiligrath, but they parted on cordial enough terms. They were not bosom friends, but they were far from being enemies.

The polemics between Heinzen, Marx, and his collaborator in communism, Friedrich Engels, cannot be analyzed here in detail.³ They began in the *Brüsseler Deutsche Zeitung* in 1847, when Engels ridiculed Heinzen as a doctrinaire republican who was content with the republicanism of the Declaration of Independence and the French revolutionary tradition of 1793 and called him "the most stupid person of the century." Heinzen promptly disposed of Engels as a "frivolous dilettante" and a mere sophist, and Engels replied that his opponent deserved a box on the ears. According to Heinzen's account, Marx intervened at this point with the publisher to suppress further contributions which Heinzen sent from Switzerland and entered the lists, in defense of Engels, with a contemptible caricature of his erstwhile friend in the *Brüsseler Zeitung*. Heinzen replied by picturing Marx as an "ape" who hopped from one Hegelian thesis and antithesis to

³ For an excellent summary of the main points see Hans Huber, *Karl Heinzen (1809-1880): Seine politische Entwicklung und publizistische Wirksamkeit* (Bern, 1932), pp. 55-65. For the continuation of the feud in America, the best sources are the *Pionier* and several of Heinzen's public lectures cited later.

another in his muddled exposition of the "communist factory and barracks state," the jailhouse for individual freedom.⁴

Stripped of its personalities, the quarrel turned on Marx's insistence that Heinzen's love of reason and justice, and his program to limit wealth, guarantee work and education for all, and gradually convert private into public ownership, did not go far enough. Marx rejected a partial or exclusively political revolution which would leave the main pillars of the house standing. A former Neo-Hegelian liberal, and much more of a systematic philosopher than Heinzen, Marx developed the latter's theories of freedom and equality into the logic of communism. He wanted a revolution which would end in common ownership just as soon as industrial changes had produced a sufficiently powerful proletariat to seize control of the state. Heinzen, on the other hand, believed that communism made the individual the slave of the state. He denied that economic necessity, stomach, and pocketbook are the only decisive forces in determining the course of history, and he rejected economic determinism and Marxian dialectics as "barbarous nonsense," which reduced man to the level of animals, overlooked all moral purpose and aesthetic values, and greatly underestimated the power of ideals in human progress.

In 1848 Heinzen summarized his critique of communism, as he understood it at that time, in a 104-page pamphlet, entitled *Die Helden des deutschen Kommunismus*, and dedicated it to Karl Marx. In this brochure he went far beyond his earlier criticisms of French communism or of the Christian communism of Wilhelm Weitling, which he actually feared because it might develop into a religious cult. Heinzen began this new attack by ridiculing those who "threw politics overboard, to soar into the clouds of their dreams, filled with the rain of happiness, in their

⁴ One of Marx's recent biographers has disposed of the incident by the following, unfair characterization of Heinzen as "a revolutionary phrasemonger, who, having fled from Germany to escape a charge of lese-majesty, was advocating a loud-mouthed communism of his own manufacture" (Otto Rühle, *Karl Marx, His Life and Works* [New York, 1929]).

Communist balloon," and then threw stones on those who remained below. He developed his fundamental thesis that political and social reform must proceed hand in hand and that one without the other, or any childish rivalry for credit between them, was nonsense. Heinzen understood the proletariat's reasons for turning to the Marxian gospel as a new religion, for he had personal knowledge of their privations, but he had nothing but contempt for the intelligentsia, whether honest men or mere demagogues, who misled the untutored workers to expect a Marxian utopia. Heinzen believed that Communists wished to "make people happy without making them free." His own plan of campaign was to establish a republic and then deal with social and economic problems by the democratic processes of free debate and popular government. He accused Marx of wanting "to break windowpanes with cannon" and of using his "whole artillery of logic, dialectic, stylistic, and learning" to annihilate those who could not see eye to eye with him. When revolution came in 1848, Marx and the Communists would have no part of it, for they considered its objectives too limited. Ever after, Heinzen held the Marxists responsible for sabotaging the revolution in France and in Germany.

Heinzen had still another reason for disliking Marx. In his reminiscences he accused Marx of reprinting a letter from Hecker in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of January 19, 1849, which had helped to defeat Heinzen in his campaign to represent Hamburg in the Frankfurt assembly. In the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* Hecker had replied to Heinzen's attacks by calling him an "uncouth, poisonous liar" and charging him with being a pensioner of the Duke of Brunswick, for whose paper Heinzen had written several contributions. Hecker's letter to the *Staatszeitung* also contained other comments reflecting on Heinzen's personal courage during the revolution and upon his alleged ambitions to be a dictator. Marx reprinted the substance of Hecker's charges, with a closing comment of his own: "This unflattering recommendation has hurt Heinzen seriously, all the

more because those who know the facts admit that 'Fritz' [Hecker] has not painted him in too dark colors."

Heinzen never forgot or forgave what he called this strange alliance between the Communist Marx and the bourgeois Hecker in a conspiracy to discredit a genuine republican. The controversy was aired in the various publications which Heinzen edited in America, and his references to the father of communism became more and more personal, culminating in 1860 in a devastating pen sketch of Marx in the *Pionier*. He described him as "a cross between a cat and an ape," a sophist, a mere dialectician, a liar and an intriguer, a man with a yellow dirty complexion, black disheveled hair, small and penetrating eyes filled with "a spirit of wicked fire," a small snubby nose, an unusually thick lower lip, a head that suggested anything but nobility and idealism, and a body always dressed in dirty linen.

The Communists in Europe and America in their turn disposed of Heinzen as a "bourgeois democrat." Heinzen refused to accept any labels for his views on economic and social questions. He had written as early as 1846: "Nowadays a lot of things get new names which sensible people used to consider merely a part of politics and of life."⁵ He resented having socialism confused with communism and defined the latter as "the science of living without the bourgeoisie, of drinking champagne without money to pay for it, of loving without marriage, and of being temporarily happy without freedom and, later, creating a social order without the state."

The Communists referred to the editor of the *Pionier* as a doubtful friend of the poor and insinuated that he was at heart an enemy of the working class. Nothing could have been further from the truth. In all he wrote Heinzen revealed the warmest sympathy for human suffering and a violent revulsion against the injustices of the present social order. One need but re-read one of his earliest essays, reprinted in his *Mehr als zwanzig*

⁵ *Politische und unpolitische Fahrten und Abenteuer* (Mannheim, 1846), I, 266.

Bogen and entitled "Observations of a Proletarian on the Cologne-Bonn Railroad," to sense Heinzen's deep compassion for mankind. The essay itself is of minor importance, one of the literary fragments that Heinzen tossed off in his early days as a publicist. But it reveals the nature of the man. In his "proletarian observations" he described travel in Europe in fourth-class railway cars, reserved for the poor, in terms that revealed a burning hatred for the injustices inherent in the existing order. Not content with the rags, the cold, the hunger, and the suffering which is the accepted lot of the poor, the idle rich, he wrote, must invent fourth-class railroad travel further to widen the gap between them. "The rich sit in the wine-houses, and we poor devils in the churches," consecrated to the "future life." Not a foot of the earth belongs to the poor, Heinzen commented bitterly, save a hole in the churchyard, provided, of course, that a priest will put the "bread of the 'Lord' " into their dying mouths before they have actually starved to death. Thus the rich keep the flesh of the earth for themselves and give the poor the bread of heaven. Heinzen never wrote a more violent indictment of the social pattern of his day. The differences between Communists and Heinzen radicals arose not from a conflict about whose lot they wished to ameliorate but from the methods to be employed in achieving their common purpose.

Heinzen had faith in human intelligence. He believed mankind could accomplish necessary reforms by rational methods of discussion and political action. "He who would use force," he wrote, "is a criminal against reason and humanity." Heinzen accepted private property as a proper measure of man's cultural advance. The institution of private property he described as the result of the utilization and conversion of the raw products of the earth into instruments of civilization by the labor of man. In the primitive, raw state of nature all property was a common possession, and it was only by the application of the mind of man to the conquest of nature that private property could originate. Since labor was the sole source of property, and

man had an inalienable right to work, Heinzen concluded that the right to work carried with it the inalienable right to acquire and hold private property. For this reason, the state must guarantee property rights to all its members and educate them so that they will learn how to acquire and cherish them. Heinzen contended that the state must own the earth on which man must live; it must abolish unfair advantages, special privilege, monopoly, and the reign of force; and it must guarantee everyone the right to work. But these demands upon the government were not for the purpose of liquidating the system of private property but in order to preserve it.

Heinzen's faith was deeply rooted in the conviction that democracy was the only humane and rational system of government. He believed that the future belonged to the republican state and that the battle for its achievement would have to be fought between royalists and republicans and not between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. He condemned the Communists for talking only about "interests" and not about "principles." "Principle," he insisted, "must be the criterion for the 'interest,' " and it must be a "just, sensible, rational humane principle." The struggle for the victory of a particular class, he felt certain, would lead only to another form of tyranny. The highest concept or "principle" of which man was capable, according to Heinzen, was the concept of liberty; and liberty must always be individual and personal, for it was this concept alone which freed man from the compulsion of force, enabled him to acquire property, live for himself, and be no man's slave. The Communists, on the contrary, would force all men into an association from which none could withdraw without starving, and Heinzen's concept of any association of persons or groups always emphasized the principle of voluntary co-operation and voluntary withdrawal.

Heinzen understood the effects of the industrial revolution and the factory system upon American society, and he was deeply disturbed thereby. He even weighed the possibilities of a

social revolution, but he would not admit that people should turn to revolution simply because their particular class wished to dominate the government. It was part of his theory and of his faith to insist that men revolt because of a great and noble idea which grips their imagination, and he believed that they could be educated eventually to demand the kind of republican state which he had in mind. Heinzen defined the state as "a consciously created society with moral purposes ruled by the rational general will."⁶ A Communist state, he thought, could not be democratically established or democratically governed. Communism could be imposed and enforced only from the top, by despotic means—a procedure which was contrary to all of Heinzen's concepts of liberty and which would force men to subordinate their consciences and their principles to economic self-interest. Finally, Heinzen rejected as the devil's own philosophy the Communist doctrine that the end justifies the means.

In 1872 the Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles published Heinzen's lecture on "Communism and Socialism." It presents a summary of his mature conclusions in regard to a subject that had exercised his mind and his emotions all his life. The lecture was delivered in the Teutonia Assembly Room in New York on March 3, 1872. In it Heinzen once more reviewed all the failures of the republican revolutionary movements since the beginning of history, only to fix full responsibility on those who had promoted quarrels and divisions over the "social question," namely, the politicians who neglected social reform and the social reformers who neglected politics. He concluded that Communist demagogues had been the worst offenders, for they had muddled many honest heads by their sophistry and were responsible for most of the factional strife among the progressive forces of the world. Heinzen suggested that Marx deserved a medal from the Kaiser, for more than any other one man he had been instrumental in dissuading the

⁶ See also *Der Heinzen'sche Staat: Eine Kritik von Stephan* (Bern, 1847); and *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*, November 21, 1886.

workers from using their power for political action. Marx was the pope of a new orthodoxy, and workers who could not understand what he wrote were his subjects. He had inflamed them to hate capital, instead of the despots; he had talked solely about economics, to the exclusion of morality and liberty; and he had led them in a wild chase after the mirage of internationalism, when it was apparent that if their problems were ever to be solved, they would have to be solved within the framework of national governments.

Heinzen made the point that slaves had been freed in America by nonslaves and that the "social question" could not be solved by the workers alone, for many of them lacked the intelligence to deal with it. He rejected the hard, sharp line of demarcation which Communists drew between workers and nonworkers. He could not accept the Communist program of concentration on the organization of the factory workers of the cities, leaving millions of domestic servants, sailors, and agricultural laborers to shift for themselves. Heinzen favored labor unions, but he opposed political parties organized solely for laboring men, although he admitted he would favor such an alignment if the time should ever come when a purely capitalist party should succeed in controlling the government to oppress the workers. By his definition, the term "worker" included the artist, the writer, and all who had to earn their living by working with either hand or brain. He made no special virtue of human labor *per se* but simply regarded it as a means to an end, that is, to secure the essentials for sustaining life. Above "work" and "worker," "class consciousness" and "class discipline"—terms which Communists had magnified almost into the lingo of a new religion—Heinzen placed his concepts of man and humanity.

Heinzen never denounced capital as such, though he had much to say about its abuse. He accepted capital, like bread, as an essential of human existence. Everybody wanted it, even the worker. It became an evil only when it was wrongly acquired or used. He admitted that a fair distribution of capital wealth

was one of the most difficult results to achieve in modern society. "We find nothing to criticize about capital," he wrote, "this universal and indispensable means to human existence and endeavor, except that not all people who need it have it, and others have more than they need." His two suggestions as to how the worker could be transformed into a capitalist were the development of co-operatives and direct help from the state. Like most immigrants of the last century he was so favorably impressed by the opportunities which the United States offered to enterprising workers that he recited on several occasions the success stories of Americans who had risen from the ranks by their own endeavors but had not forgotten their obligations toward the class from which they had sprung.

The wage system, according to Heinzen's theory of economics, was the nexus of the whole social structure. Therefore, he did not wish to abolish it or to equalize it. He favored organization of the employed in order to secure higher pay. But he pleaded with labor unions to forget their blind hatred of capital and to be content with opposing the unjust uses of its power. He reviewed human experience from Plato's *Republic* to the *Communist Manifesto* to prove that only by bloody revolution could private property be abolished and to show that, even if this were accomplished, the result would be worse reaction. Only by tyrannical dictatorship or by a sudden conversion of all men into fanatical ascetics could the property concept be destroyed, and Heinzen contended that such an achievement would be disastrous to art and science and would produce such regimentation as to make the autocracy of monarchy preferable.

In contrast with his diatribes against communism, Heinzen wrote favorably about socialism, at least as he defined it. It was the aim of Socialists, he contended, to provide everyone with personal property as the necessary basis on which the public welfare could be built. It was also their aim to preserve the free competitive system by aiding the weak and restraining the strong. The Socialist state, in Heinzen's opinion, would be far

more than a police state. It would provide the opportunities for everyone to help himself, without depriving anyone of the possibilities of self-help. It would be a democratic, humanizing institution. It would provide educational facilities for all, regardless of race, sex, class, or color, in order to prepare them not only for a desirable material existence but also for the proper exercise as rational beings of their obligations and responsibilities toward the commonwealth. The state would guarantee work to every citizen, by state aid, by liberal credit from the treasury, and by the support of workers' associations. Wages would be fixed not on an hourly basis, or on an equalitarian scale, but according to the values created, after a modest interest had been allowed for capital and materials and after managing skills had been justly compensated. The state would have the right to expropriate for the common good and to limit the rate of return on capital, to regulate the hours of labor, to reduce dividends by shortening the worker's daily tasks, to encourage co-operatives, and to legislate generally for the public welfare.

Graduated income and inheritance taxes were part of the Socialist program which Heinzen accepted, and, as suggested above, he wanted the state to be the sole owner of the land. Actual settlers would cultivate it at a fixed rental paid to the state, and income from the land would eventually become the state's main source of revenue. Heinzen also favored a tax on the unearned increment of land, although he did not develop this proposal into the single-tax philosophy which Henry George championed later. Finally, Heinzen agreed that some of the means of production would eventually be socialized and operated for public service and not for profit, but his preference continued to be strongly in favor of a co-operative system of industry and agriculture.⁷

All this amounts to socialism, in one of its many forms. Heinzen was willing to accept the label for himself, provided

⁷ See also *Der Sozialist* (Milwaukee), February 8, 1876.

it covered only the principles set forth in the preceding paragraphs. He clung stubbornly to his doctrinaire radicalism, which embraced all reforms in the interest of humanity and justice, and he refused to regard the improvement of the conditions of labor as its sole objective. Workers must be, or must become, men, he argued. As such, they must support all forms of progress and intellectual and political emancipation, and they must make their influence count within the framework of the democratic process and Heinzen's definition of individual liberty.

How Heinzen, in view of the analysis of his views about the state and individual rights presented above, could possibly have been classified as an anarchist is difficult to understand, yet that was the case both during his lifetime and since. George Schumm, who in later years proclaimed himself a philosophical anarchist, wrote that Heinzen had defended individualism to the point where it "bordered on anarchism," though he would have rejected the label.⁸ In an essay on "Karl Heinzen and Anarchism," published in *Liberty* (Boston) on August 1, 1891, another writer paid tribute to Heinzen's ability and humanitarian sympathies and concluded that "he came as near being an Anarchist as is possible without yet being one . . . he dwelt apart from and in hostility to general society . . . [and] really occupied ground next door to Anarchism." And in a recent study of native American anarchism, reference is made to Heinzen as one "whose enthusiasm for reform brought him to a kind of anarchism."⁹

It is true that Heinzen was a great admirer of Proudhon and Mikhail Bakunin. The latter was a friend of Ruge and Herwegh, and Heinzen wrote a warm tribute to Bakunin at the time of his death. Heinzen wanted to reduce the functions of the state to a minimum in order to preserve the greatest amount of in-

⁸ *Libertas* (Boston), April 7, 1888.

⁹ Eunice M. Schuster, *Native American Anarchism* ("Smith College Studies in History," Vol. XVII), pp. 124-25.

dividual initiative. As a general principle, he championed private enterprise against state monopoly. He wished to use the state only in order to insure that justice would be done between contending groups and individuals. He made education a state affair but would not compel citizens to use the schools, and on most matters he preferred voluntary action to compulsion. He wanted the state to provide opportunities for public amusements and, perhaps, even dwellings. He rejected Proudhon's proposal that rent and interest be abolished. Heinzen maintained that the state, which exists for the individual, must help each citizen to accomplish such just ends as he could not accomplish by himself and must see to it that no individual or association of individuals carries out a program injurious to other individuals or to the whole people. Since adequate private means were not available, he heartily approved of the establishing of schools, hospitals, poorhouses, parks, and art museums by the state. In one of his essays on the rights of women he wrote: "Anarchy in its bad sense is barbarism, and in its good sense an impossibility." In another connection he described the ideal government as the state of the future which would be based on "an ennobled Greek state plus socialism achieved in practice." He was always fearful that the state might acquire too many functions and thus become a danger to the people, but he stopped far short of wanting to abolish it. If his views, as developed during a lifetime of controversy, were not always entirely consistent, he was no different in this respect from many others who tried to thread their way through the changing interpretations of socialism, communism, and anarchism.

Heinzen was sure that a paper like the *Pionier* would not have been permitted in a Communist state. This was another reason why he opposed communism with all the force he could muster. He was convinced that Marx and his satellites did not believe in the kind of liberalism and freedom of thought and discussion in which he believed, and later events which have revealed

communism in practice prove that he was right. Heinzen revolted against any system which tried to freeze men's minds or their bodies to their present places or to hold them in line for a particular economic and social system, even if it were his own. The basis of all his thinking was the principle that life is constantly changing and that there can be no stopping anywhere. Without free choice and free speech, the human adventure would stagnate and become intolerable tyranny. Heinzen believed this so strongly that, when Bismarck began to persecute the Communists in the new German Empire, he rose to their defense, faithful even in this case to his conviction that freedom of speech means nothing unless it includes freedom for others to express ideas that one hates.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

A RADICAL'S FOREIGN POLICY

DURING THE MORE THAN A QUARTER-CENTURY when Heinzen was a restless and frustrated American observer of a European scene in which he felt qualified to play the role of a major actor, the forces of nationalism and liberalism precipitated one crisis after another on both sides of the Atlantic and wrought transformations, whose repercussions are still being felt throughout the world, in the life of the peoples of both continents. Eagerly the editor of the *Pionier* scanned the political horizon for signs of new revolutions and resurgent republicanism.

Revolution is "the perpetuum mobile of history, the ruthless creative force of mankind, the sower and the builder. . . . If I believed in a God, I would call him Revolution." It is "the life, the future, the hope, the salvation, the poetry" of the world. In these few sentences, delivered as part of a lecture in Columbus, Ohio, in 1852, Heinzen announced the faith by which he lived and worked. Here is the key to his attitudes and reactions to the questions of foreign policy which arose during his lifetime. The events of 1848-49 had left their indelible imprint upon the frustrated revolutionist. They constituted at once the greatest disappointment of Heinzen's life and his abiding inspiration. He clung passionately to a faith in the ultimate republican regeneration of Germany—and of the world. Heinzen regarded the right of revolution as one of the few inalienable natural rights of men.

All other natural rights might be circumscribed by action of the majority, but never the right of the individual to rebel.

As he grew older, Heinzen realized that he would not live to see the emancipation of his fatherland, but his enthusiasm for agitation remained undiminished to his dying day. "Spring had come too soon" in Europe, he concluded, and the late frost of reaction had killed the tender sprouts of revolution which had appeared all over the Continent in 1848; but he was sure that the vigorous plant of republicanism would grow anew, no matter how often it was trampled underfoot. Stronger than the conspiracy of reaction was the urge of the human spirit for freedom. Heinzen nourished that spirit by continuing to write revolutionary propaganda and smuggling it into Europe. For Heinzen there could be no middle ground and no compromise between total liberty and tyranny.¹ He would have preferred Goethe's "true revolution of the spirit" to violence, but he knew that only in the United States could reform be achieved without the use of force. German periodicals like the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes* and the Leipzig *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* took notice of the agitation of the editor of the *Pionier* from across the sea, only to ridicule him as "a dreamer and a mere talker," whose influence had died with 1848, who had learned nothing since that fateful year, and whose techniques were wholly outmoded. Heinzen could only reply: "As long as there are people in any country who suffer injustice, it is the duty of true radicals to help them." *Ubi libertas, ibi patria*.

Each year Heinzen watched for new signs of revolution, and each year he convinced himself that they were discernible on the political horizons of France, Hungary, Spain, Germany, Italy, Poland, and elsewhere. He urged his American countrymen to watch for them, too, and to be ready to support the forces of re-

¹ See, e.g., "Ueber die bevorstehende Revolution," a lecture delivered in New York, March 6, 1853; and a lecture on Thomas Paine, delivered at the Cincinnati Turner Hall in 1855 and reprinted in *Teutscher Radikalismus* (n.p. 1867). See also *Editoren-Kongress* (Boston, 1872), pp. 185-96; *Erlebtes* (Boston, 1874), II, 231; and an article by Karl Schmemann in *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*, October 3, 1886.

publicanism wherever they might become active again. He spoke at Polish meetings in New York and hailed the Poles as a truly revolutionary people, though he deplored their extreme nationalism. He sang the praises of Garibaldi and then broke with the leader of the Red Shirts when the latter surrendered his power to the king of Sardinia and became a "princely tool." But he helped raise a Garibaldi Fund in America to support Italian republicans. At the close of the Civil War, when the Irish Fenians staged their foolhardy invasion of Canada as a gesture to advance the cause of Irish freedom, Heinzen welcomed that strange phenomenon as "perhaps the finest example of revolutionary organization of all time." And when his friend Mazzini dispatched agents to the United States to seek support for a "universal republic," to spread liberty throughout Europe, Heinzen gave the plan his immediate and unqualified indorsement.

It is true that Heinzen's propaganda was essentially anti-monarchical, but he had far more in mind than the overthrow of kings. Heinzen derived his concepts of republicanism from such tangible sources as the Declaration of the Rights of the English Parliament of 1648 and the Declaration of Independence of 1776, and he frequently reprinted such documents in the *Pionier* to inspire both German radicalism and North American republicanism. Heinzen praised the republican features of the English constitutional system and pointed to the British as the proudest people on earth "because they are the freest." He was never a nationalist, not even a republican nationalist, and he insisted that men must learn to think first of freedom and progress for all humanity and only secondarily of the achievements of their particular nation.² Heinzen had no patience with secret diplomacy. He wanted a great European Congress of Peoples to settle matters by the democratic method. When the United States planned the Centennial Exposition of 1876, Heinzen protested vigorous-

² He expressed this idea as early as June 8, 1844, in an article in the *Mannheimer Abendzeitung*.

ly against making it an American affair. He wanted to celebrate a century of republicanism, with exhibits showing the progress not of industry but of human freedom, and he wished the government to invite representatives from all the existing republics, and all outstanding republicans, to Philadelphia as guests of the nation, to exchange ideas, stimulate reform, and co-operate against all the enemies of liberty. Like John Adams, Heinzen had a vision of America as "a grand scheme . . . for the illumination and emancipation of the slavish parts of mankind all over the world."

Heinzen opposed militarism wherever he found it because he believed it to be the foe of liberty and the enemy of republicanism. He hated the caste system which army life bred and perpetuated. "The soldier's life," he wrote during the Civil War, "is a joke, a stupidity, a brutality, a barbarism, a curse to mankind," and a standing army should be tolerated only as a necessary evil in time of violent conflict. Soldiering, he added, is the most "soulless of all barbarism." Particularly did he hate the German system of compulsory military training, attributing the failure of the democratic movement largely to the stupidity and blind obedience inculcated in the army by officers who did not hesitate to use their men to fire on their fellow-citizens. As early as 1846 Heinzen had circulated revolutionary pamphlets in Germany attacking the military.³ His most detailed and devastating attacks on the military state were his "Thirty Articles of War for the New Day" and his *German Soldiers' Catechism*, published on the eve of the Revolution of 1848 in an edition of a thousand copies and distributed among the garrison at Rastatt. Later, this *Soldiers' Catechism* was reprinted several times in the *Pionier*, along with *A European Soldier to His Comrades*; and the Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles issued a

³ See "Ausflug eines wild gewordenen preussischen Landwehroffiziers in das deutsche Vaterland," in *Politische und unpolitische Fahrten und Abenteuer* (Mannheim, 1846), I, 179-232; and "Geheimer Bericht des geheimen Polizeiraths Hehahouang an den chinesischen Polizei-minister Peng-Peng," in *Mehr als zwanzig Bogen* (Darmstadt, 1845).

cheap edition in a format small enough to permit its insertion in letters to Europe, selling these propaganda leaflets at the price of a dozen for twenty-five cents. Heinzen's exposure of the evils of German militarism was accompanied by an appeal to the army to mutiny against their officers and their king and never to use their guns against their own countrymen or against any foreign people struggling for freedom. To make the appeal more specific, and to demonstrate just how crowned heads might be removed by the bullets of their own soldiers, Heinzen proceeded to explain the qualifications of a true soldier as "an armed member of a free people, who uses his weapon only for his people, and never against them." In the catechetical style of questions and answers, the pamphlet closed with specific instructions for revolution.

In the 1860's and 1870's when all Europe was developing into what the *Pionier* called a "murderer's cave," and Germany was being unified under Prussian military pressure, Heinzen pleaded again for general disarmament. He saw his own people losing their historic mission of cultural and intellectual leadership in Europe, because of the dominance of the Junker class and the crushing burdens of taxation and compulsory military service. He was equally disturbed about the future of his adopted country, with a professional soldier in the White House and the G.A.R., "a newly created Pretorian guard," expanding into a decisive factor in American elections and a positive menace to the republic. He predicted it would seek pensions and political spoils and become the tool of political manipulators.

It followed from Heinzen's relentless exposures of militarism that he also rejected war as an instrument of national policy. In one of his lectures in which he described the impressions of a visitor from another planet as he watched the wars of this earth, he had the observer comment ironically, "He who receives the most wounds, must be in the wrong, and he who loses his life, has justice and reason against him."⁴ Heinzen concluded

⁴ "Salomonische Weisheit," in *Teutscher Radikalismus*, II, 186.

that those who have the best instruments of murder must be called the most "civilized." Why not build a "tank," he queried in 1862, for use on land, "an armor-plated steam wagon," that could be driven over any terrain? Arm it with cannon and guns, he suggested, and attach huge projecting scythes to its front wheels, so that it could mow down everything it encountered. If rival armies had such equipment, military tactics would be revolutionized, and if balloons, poison gas, and other implements of destruction could be added, it would become unnecessary to have huge field armies. Perhaps then it would come to pass that the nation which invents the most barbaric instruments of mass murder will in the long run serve humanity best, for only by making war as savage as possible would men learn to substitute tribunals of arbitration. During the Franco-German War, Heinzen wrote: "If an individual dies, his friends mourn; if men kill each other by the hundreds of thousands, they have celebrations. . . . All nations, winners and losers, should go into mourning after a war, not only for the dead, but because of the necessity of killing their enemies."

Suggestive of William James's moral equivalents for war, Heinzen extolled the kind of courage which is based on intelligence and on the understanding of the true value of sacrifice. Intellectual and moral courage and the will to live honorably, for truth and justice, he argued, required qualities of manhood far superior to mere physical prowess or the will to die in combat on a battlefield. The battle against stupidity, hypocrisy, prejudice, fear, and injustice, willingness to sacrifice for noble ideals, and courage to stand alone in the struggle against falsehood were Heinzen's moral equivalents for war for the man who would be truly free. He could find no evidence in history of a logical connection between justice and the victory of the strongest battalions, and he thought it ridiculous to discuss "rules of war," for the whole war system was a reversion to barbarism.⁵ He had nothing but contempt for the artists, sculptors, and battle paint-

⁵ See "Ueber den Muth" (1850), in *ibid.*, pp. 83-100.

ers who glorified and idealized war. "I would represent in a battle picture," he wrote, "a Napoleon quietly seated on a drum among heaps of lacerated corpses, with his boots sunk in blood above their spurs, smilingly taking a draught from the field-flask of a corporal, and listening to the enthusiastic shouts of his surviving, murdering slaves, 'Vive l'Empereur!'"⁶

Heinzen's formula for world peace was simple. He would destroy all thrones and depose all monarchs by a revolution carried out by soldiers, educated at last to a realization of the stupidity and barbarism of their profession. He was willing to except a genuine war of liberation from his sweeping denunciations of all appeals to force, provided it proved unavoidable and was the only means to destroy oppression. He hoped that the political emancipation of women would speed the day of world peace, for women suffered most from war and therefore might prove more humane than men, and he indorsed heartily Julia Howe's appeal in the *Boston Woman's Journal* for a woman's congress to end war. His friend Amand Gögg lectured in the Boston Turner Hall in 1872 on plans for a league of peace, and Heinzen himself frequently published his own proposals for a union of Europe, dominated by a free France and a free Germany. He favored a world court, and in the last year of his life wrote a moving article advocating a union of European republics, pledged to preserve and defend the political independence and the territorial integrity of the member-states, to stop all forceful annexations, and to support a general congress to settle all disputes. But, in spite of his deep-seated opposition to war, Heinzen had little sympathy with the conscientious objector who refused for religious reasons to bear arms. He contended that every coward might take refuge in "religious scruples" and a tender conscience and that every citizen had an equal obligation to defend the state.

A comprehension of the principles and attitudes summarized above is necessary in order to understand Heinzen's position on

⁶ *What Is Humanity?* (Indianapolis, 1877), pp. 19-20.

the specific issues of diplomacy and international relations which arose in his day on both sides of the Atlantic. Heinzen favored and supported all movements leading toward republicanism and opposed monarchical governments as the root of all evil. This was the core of his revolutionary doctrine. Heinzen's major interests were concerned with Germany and the United States. For his old fatherland he continued to hope for liberation; for the new he desired a foreign policy worthy of the world's greatest republic.

Heinzen's foreign policy for America revolved around his interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. He regarded that doctrine as essential to the preservation of free government in the Western Hemisphere. But he also believed it imposed a deep obligation upon the United States to help other peoples, still under the heel of reaction, to win their liberties. Heinzen did not believe in American isolation, nor did he favor an American policy of neutrality. As early as 1852 he had repudiated the notion that North America had no other task save to furnish the world with an example of free government. He wanted North America to concern itself actively with the affairs of Europe and not sit passively by until reaction and despotism had spread to the point where in self-protection the United States would have to accept the challenge to battle. He was sure that if England and America had shipped war materials to the Hungarians and Italians in 1849, the European revolution would have been saved. In 1852 Heinzen urged the United States government to abandon its policy of nonintervention and neutrality and to intervene in any struggle for liberty anywhere. As an earnest of its intentions, he favored an immediate gift of ten million dollars to Louis Kossuth, to be used for the liberation of Hungary.

Before the Civil War, Heinzen frequently referred to the Monroe Doctrine as a slaveholder's shibboleth which was being used to justify expansion of slave territory and "manifest destiny." He was disturbed by the failure of the American govern-

ment to prevent British control of the Mosquito Coast in Central America, by French and Spanish intrigues in South America and the Caribbean, and by the intermarriage of the royal houses of France and Brazil. He regretted that the doctrine had been formulated only after European powers had already acquired all they could get in the Americas and that it was now too late to expel them from their possessions. He was suspicious lest Canada grow into a nation of a hundred million subjects of "her gracious queen," Victoria. He viewed with concern the confederation of the British North American provinces into the Dominion of Canada in 1867 and would have favored a plan to annex Canada to the United States.

In 1864 the editor of the *Pionier* journeyed to Washington to interview Senator Sumner on American foreign policy. The two men talked briefly, and Sumner asked Heinzen to send him his views in writing. A draft of Heinzen's fifteen-page manuscript was preserved among his papers. It constituted a complete statement of principles, as he thought they should be applied to all nations. Heinzen began his draft with his familiar pronouncement on the "hostile and irreconcilable contrast between republican and despotic governments." Heinzen thought his fellow-Americans were strangely blind to this simple fact. "They still believe friendship between the occupants of royal palaces and those of the White House possible." He demanded an end of diplomatic intercourse with the monarchical governments of Europe and would have no traffic with the despoilers of liberty. He illustrated the results of a merely passive, defensive attitude by the events in Mexico which had brought Napoleon III, that "perjurer and murderer of liberty by profession" and destroyer of the French, Roman, and Mexican republics, to the southern border of the United States. For all practical purposes, Heinzen regarded Mexico as a "part of the United States," and therefore a policy of neutrality toward the French "crime" against our southern neighbor seemed suicidal, even as a price for French nonintervention in the Civil War. He urged the Ameri-

can government to declare that "any monarchical intervention in America" would be met with revolutionary, republican intervention in Europe.

Heinzen would have occupied Texas in 1861, "assisted by the loyal Germans" of West Texas; he would have fitted out privateers against the Confederates and sent help to the Mexican Republic. He felt certain that a vigorous and aggressive policy toward Europe would make the "despots" abandon their designs on America. Heinzen feared not only the French and the Austrians but also the Spaniards in Cuba, and he viewed the successful establishment of monarchy in Mexico as the forerunner of similar events in Central and South America, where despots could count upon the support of the "power of Romanism." Heinzen believed that the danger was real, for he thought European monarchs had a "common desire to fight and suppress revolution and republicanism wherever they exist." To counteract their diabolical designs, he proposed secret appropriations to assist the revolutionary forces of Europe and an appropriation of fifty million dollars to enable the war department to "avert dangers" threatening from abroad. "The Monroe Doctrine," he concluded, "can be better maintained in Paris than in Mexico." "This republic owes its existence to revolution, and from revolution, not from diplomacy, it must expect its safety." He advocated the good-neighbor policy toward all the weaker powers in this hemisphere and was ready to have the United States assume full responsibility for their protection against European aggressors.

Heinzen considered the American expedition which, at the middle of the last century, opened Japan to the West at the point of a gun an unwarranted act of aggression, perpetrated by executive fiat, and without the sanction of Congress or the people; and in 1873, when the British and Russians were trying to perfect an agreement for the control of Asia, he urged American support for Japan as a counterweight to this power diplomacy. Seward's purchase of Alaska provoked the comment that the

United States had acquired an "ice box," inhabited only by mosquitoes and cockroaches. When the French company under De Lesseps projected an isthmian canal through Panama, Heinzen concluded that the United States had no just ground to protest because the Monroe Doctrine was not part of international law. At the same time he advocated an American canal, controlled by this country, and one of his last editorials deplored the lack of interest in a venture so vital to American security.

Cuba, the Pearl of the Antilles, figured frequently as an issue of American foreign policy before the Spanish-American War. For several decades it was coveted by slaveholders as a new area for the expansion of the South's peculiar institution. In spite of this fact, and of Heinzen's radical abolitionist views, he had favored the conquest of the island as early as 1852, first, because it would drive the Spanish reactionaries out of another colony and, second, because such a course would probably involve the United States in a conflict with European monarchies. He also believed annexation might hasten secession, thus contributing indirectly to the solution of the slavery question. In 1869 Heinzen denounced as a national disgrace the failure of the United States to help the Cuban insurgents. In 1873 when a new crisis arose with Spain, because of American filibustering expeditions to Cuba, Heinzen favored an invasion of the island to abolish slavery there; but, because Spain at that time was controlled by a government of liberals and republicans, he urged the return of the colony to the Spanish authorities, leaving the latter to deal with the insurgents as they saw fit.

Heinzen's interest in Mexico antedated the French invasion of the Civil War period. He had speculated on the possibilities of a Mexican revolution ever since his second arrival in the United States, partly because of his antagonism to the Catholic church in Mexico. He had urged German immigrants to settle there and to find, across the Rio Grande, an escape from the blight of slavocracy and Know-Nothingism which fell upon the United States in the 1850's. Napoleon's plan to conquer Mexico

and put an Austrian prince on the Mexican throne aroused Heinzen to fighting fury. He saw in the maneuver a direct threat to the United States, and he fixed responsibility for the intervention upon the "bandit in Paris," "the lackeys in Mexico," and the "cowardly traitors" in Washington. "Not the honor of France," he wrote, "but the honor of North America is at stake in Mexico." He favored recruiting Civil War veterans to invade Mexico and denied that such a plan would violate American neutrality laws.

The Mexicans under Juárez eventually succeeded in driving out the foreigner, and the Emperor Maximilian, unhappy puppet of French imperialism, fell before a firing squad. Heinzen wasted no sympathy on the Austrian archduke but hailed his execution as "a great deed" by which Mexicans had taught the world a lesson in true republicanism. He ridiculed the false sentimentality of those who bemoaned the fate of a royal prince and ignored the thousands of Mexicans slain by Maximilian's army. Schurz and Seward and Greeley appealed for mercy for the puppet emperor; Heinzen regarded his execution as an act of just retribution. For a time Juárez was one of his heroes—a man of the people who had risen from the ranks to liberate his country from despotism—but when, in 1868, Mexico revised her constitution and established a presidency, Heinzen lost some of his enthusiasm. America is suffering from "excellency sickness," he concluded, and the "presidency makes politicians into rascals," whether it be in Haiti, Santo Domingo, Mexico, or the United States.

Turning to the other side of the Atlantic, we may consider first the attitude of the *Pionier* toward England. Unlike many Germans of his day and since, Heinzen differentiated sharply between British foreign policy and the republican character of English institutions. For the latter, Heinzen had great respect. He did not like the monarchical trappings or the Tory aristocracy of the British government but admired its complete freedom of speech, press, and assembly, and he rated British judi-

cial procedure higher than that of any other country. British imperialism and the ruthless struggle for trade monopoly was another matter. Heinzen was furious when American democrats, dazzled by British royalty, welcomed the Prince of Wales in 1860. He suspected some ulterior motive, perhaps a plan to reunite the United States with the mother-country in order to build a vast Anglo-Saxon empire to dominate the trade of the world. In 1869, when the United States pressed for a settlement of the "Alabama" claims and insisted that England be held responsible for permitting Confederate commerce raiders to be built in her shipyards, Heinzen prepared a total bill of damages amounting to a billion dollars but insisted that the issue must be settled short of war.

Continental European problems were always viewed by Heinzen from the perspective of 1848. He carried on a lively correspondence with German revolutionary leaders like Sigel and Ruge and Schimmelpfennig, and the correspondents addressed each other as "citizen," after the fashion of the French Revolution. Shortly after Heinzen's arrival in the United States, Gottfried Kinkel, the German professor, poet, and revolutionary agitator, whom the young Schurz had so dramatically liberated from his Prussian prison, came to the United States to float a "national loan" of two million dollars for a new uprising in Germany. Even before he left London, the German refugees had split into two factions, one bitterly hostile to Kinkel; and the quarrel begun in London was continued in the United States. Heinzen joined the opposition, as might have been expected, and appealed to the Germans to give their dollars to the group known as the Agitationsverein, in which Struve, Ruge, Fickler, Gögg, August Becker, Blind, and Sigel played leading roles. Heinzen became convinced that Kinkel had, in some mysterious way, become the puppet of German Communists who were pulling the strings from London, and presently the two men were involved in a personal feud. Heinzen accused Kinkel of squandering the money collected in America on unnecessary

travel and administrative expense and charged that the funds were kept on deposit in London, without proper accounting, instead of being used to pay for revolutionary pamphlets.

Heinzen's attack on Kinkel so shortly after his arrival did much to develop a factional split among the Germans in America, Heinzen regarding the professor as an inexperienced dreamer. At a congress in Cincinnati, which voted to float two million dollars in German bonds, in denominations up to \$100 at 5 per cent interest, Kinkel's campaign was officially launched. Weitling, Körner, Hecker, and Anneke supported the plan, while Heinzen upheld the German Revolutionary League, founded in Philadelphia for the same purpose. Heinzen's correspondence concerning the Kinkel episode reveals that radical reformers seem to be by nature chronically unfitted to work together in harmony. Heinzen not only belittled Kinkel's ability, sincerity, and techniques but raised the question of his honesty as well. No one seemed to have precise information as to how much money had been collected in the United States or how the accounts stood in London, where it was on deposit, or how it would eventually be used. Kinkel did not favor grandiose schemes for an international revolution, and he fell victim to the bitter factionalism that developed in London and in the United States over differences of strategy. Mazzini pulled away from Kinkel's group; there were other defections because of various plans to divide the available funds; the German Workers' party had its own program; North and South Germans could not agree; and, as usual, the Marxists played a lone hand.

By the end of 1852 Heinzen was through with Kinkel. He called him a "humbugger"—a favorite term which his short stay in the United States had added to his already picturesque vocabulary—and accused him of designs to become "the dictator of the Revolution." Heinzen took peculiar delight in pointing out that Kinkel had raised \$8,000 in America and had spent \$2,170 for travel, whereas Heinzen had received only \$1,200 from the United States for four years of agitation, and

an additional \$1,800 in Germany, and with this amount had supported his family, paid his travel expenses, and published his revolutionary brochures. For years after Kinkel's departure German-American leaders quarreled over his mission. In 1858 the contributors from New Orleans demanded that their money be given to refugees; the Detroiters wished to use their share for a German school; and the people of Pittsburgh asked that it be returned to the original donors. In 1860 the *Illinois Staatszeitung* proposed that the money still on deposit in London be turned over to Italian revolutionaries. Heinzen approved but suggested that a portion be given to the German Teachers' Seminary. In 1865, after the money had been on deposit for thirteen years, Heinzen made a final suggestion that the \$5,000 still on hand be surrendered to a committee of refugees in London, which was to include Blind and Freiligrath.

Louis Kossuth, the Hungarian patriot, made a similar appeal to America for support of the Hungarian revolution. He was enthusiastically received, spoke in many places and occasionally to wholly German audiences, and raised substantial amounts for his cause. Kossuth had been familiar with Heinzen's revolutionary writings as early as 1846, and the latter had lauded the Hungarian revolutionist in one of his earliest American journals and advocated giving Kossuth ten million dollars from the United States Treasury. Heinzen hated Austria as one of the worst centers of reaction in all Europe and looked forward to a day when Galicia, Hungary, and northern Italy would shake off Austrian rule and the polyglot empire of the Hapsburgs, reduced to German Austria, would be ready for *Anschluss* to Germany. Always an enemy of Prussia, he dreamed of a day when Vienna would be the capital of a unified German republic, and the Balkan States would form a Danubian union, under the aegis of Germany. In the first number of his *Janus* Heinzen addressed an open letter to Kossuth, from an "exile" to a "tribune and a Messiah." The letter was friendly but critical in tone, and Heinzen wanted assurances that the Hungarian was a true re-

publican, a Socialist, and a believer in revolutionary solidarity, that is, in a world-wide, international movement. Heinzen's references to Hungarian culture and exaggerated nationalism were hardly tactful, and he advised Kossuth to depend on the Germans but to shun the Communists, adding that the future of Hungary itself would be decided by what happened in Germany and France. For several months longer Heinzen defended Kossuth against the charge that he was not interested in justice for the workers, socialism, or abolitionism, but Heinzen's doubts about the genuineness of Kossuth's radicalism began to multiply. By midsummer of 1852 he rejected the latter's plan for a league of Germany, Italy, and Hungary, because it excluded France, and by 1856 the *Pionier* closed its books on Louis Kossuth. An aristocrat at heart, "the morning star of the revolution" had become the "brilliant evening star of the reaction."

In 1858 Heinzen tried once more to outline a program for the emancipation of Europe. His ultimate goal was a European congress of peoples which would substitute democratic methods for secret diplomacy. Until such international machinery could be created, he favored a temporary system of alliances, with France and Germany leading the way. Holland would be absorbed into a united German republic and receive security and markets in exchange for her fleet and colonies. Denmark might have to be annexed by force in order to insure a continuous coast line for the Franco-German partnership. A defensive alliance would be concluded with Hungary, but with proper safeguards lest the Magyars block the German road to the Black Sea and Turkey. Heinzen believed that Germany's "west," her "frontier," lay along the Danube toward Turkey and that she alone could develop the Danubian basin economically. Furthermore, he favored German hegemony in the Balkans in order to checkmate Russia. Austria would become a part of Germany; and the French and German liberal governments would combine forces to establish a free Poland. The blueprint is interest-

ing, but Heinzen himself was forced to change some of his views in the light of developments in the next decade and a half.

Heinzen's faith in the French people as the inexhaustible source of republicanism was never shaken. It brought down upon his head the charge that he had denied the blood of his fathers, to become a fanatical Francophile. That accusation did not add to Heinzen's popularity among the German-Americans, but there was much truth in the statement. Early in life Heinzen had fallen under the spell of the French Revolution. Among his papers were leaflets published at the time of Robespierre, revolutionary songs and poems, and circulars in praise of liberty, fraternity, and equality. Voltaire and Robespierre were his heroes. He admired Ledru-Rollin as a genuine republican, and he regarded the French people as "the mightiest lever . . . for European Revolution." He disagreed with Mazzini because the latter trusted the English more than the French. In Heinzen's scheme of things, Paris remained the center from which republicanism must spread to the rest of Europe. He was sure that the nation of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists would never yield to the ultramontanism of the Catholic church. France could not become a Spain or a Paraguay! Heinzen's hope for revolution rested upon the Latins, not the Teutons.

Napoleon's coup d'état of 1851, leading to the re-establishment of the Empire, was a cruel blow to Heinzen's hopes. He issued an "extra" of the *Janus* when the news of the dissolution of the French parliament reached New York, and it was the first and only time that Heinzen resorted to that practice. Ruge, writing from London on December 4, 1851, was not yet certain whether Paris was on the verge of revolution or a military coup d'état. Heinzen found it hard to believe that Napoleon's plans for a dictatorship could be carried out; they did not fit into his scheme of the logic of history and the law of political evolution. He counted on the army and the people to rise against the intriguer. Presently Ruge wrote again to say that the republicans had lost the battle, and Schurz pointed out that they had never

had the support of the workers. Heinzen still refused to abandon his faith that the French would rise again to destroy the new Napoleon. He had to wait twenty years to see the Third French Republic emerge from the wreckage of the Franco-German War.

After 1851 Heinzen always referred to Napoleon III as "the bandit." Years later, hostile newspapermen circulated a wild tale to the effect that Heinzen had agreed to put his theories of tyrannicide into practice, by murdering Napoleon, for a fee of twenty thousand dollars and added that he had pocketed part of the money. The story was as libelous as the earlier tales about Heinzen's misuse of refugee funds or the later yarn that he had received five thousand dollars from John C. Frémont to enlist the Germans in his campaign for president. Heinzen would have welcomed a pistol shot into the brain of the dictator who had ruined his dream of a French republic, and he reminded his readers that a single dagger thrust had produced a republic in Rome. Six years later, when Orsini attempted to assassinate Napoleon, the *Pionier* hailed the deed as an instrument of political freedom and promptly issued a new printing of Heinzen's treatise on tyrannicide. Celebrations to honor Orsini were held in New York, Boston, and Cincinnati. In Boston speeches were made in Italian, French, English, and German, Douai making the German address. When William Lloyd Garrison refused to preside, Heinzen commented "Garrison thinks too Christian." His extravagant praise of Orsini provoked the *New York Times* of April 26, 1858, to refer to Heinzen as "a rabid Red Republican, who has long disgusted the sensible portion of the German people by his fierce tirades in the *Pioneer* [*sic*]." When the government in Washington recognized "the bandit" as the lawful ruler of France, Heinzen was furious. He assailed "Jupiter Capitolinus Fillmore" for refusing to appear at a banquet honoring Kossuth and a weak-kneed Congress for denying help to the liberator of Hungary. Yet both approved the dictator in Paris! Fillmore and the "God-like Daniel" (Webster), Heinzen wrote,

would recognize the czar if he came to France and seized the government in Paris!

Though the *Pionier* reported events in America and Europe with unusual completeness, the chief concern of its editor was for his fatherland. The German people were developing rapidly into one of the world's great powers. If the heads of Germans everywhere began to swell with pride because of this remarkable achievement in the short space of two decades, their feelings are understandable. Heinzen, too, had longed for the unification of Germany, and, to that extent, he was a nationalist. But as early as 1844, in several contributions to the *Mannheimer Abendzeitung*, he had made it clear that unification would not be worth the cost if it were not accompanied by freedom for the German people. He ridiculed those Germans who beat their breasts with pride and shouted, "We are Germans," yet had no understanding of republican liberties. In 1845, in a repentant mood, he had written: "I too had my period when I dreamed and 'gushed' about German expansion, German navies, and German colonies. . . . I surpassed all others in malicious, chauvinistic attacks on the Dutch. May I be forgiven!"⁷

As a young man, Heinzen had pictured his fatherland remolded according to the pattern of the North American republic. He envisaged a federated German republic, with enough centralization to guarantee national unity and enough local autonomy to insure the freedom of the member-states. He approved of a president, or an executive council, as the head of the German federation, but later he accepted all the implications of self-government inherent in the parliamentary principle and abandoned federalism.

Heinzen discovered the menacing growth of the power of Prussia very early in his career. In 1857, in an editorial in the *Pionier*, he analyzed Prussia's designs to become "a great power" by stealing or otherwise acquiring additional territory. As most German-Americans, including liberals like Friedrich

⁷ *Mehr als zwanzig Bogen*, p. 231.

Kapp and Gustav Körner, waxed more enthusiastic about Bismarck's rise to power, Heinzen became more alarmed lest unification should result in a state dominated by Junkers, bureaucrats, police, and army. He feared both Prussian and Austrian hegemony over the German states. In 1866 he advocated the forceful assimilation of Prussia, the inclusion of the eight million Austrian Germans in the German federation, and the moving of the capital to Vienna. A year later, after the Austro-Prussian War, he added: "If Germany is to be absorbed into Prussia, the domain of the Hohenzollerns, then the whole thousand years of German history has been an illusion and a lie, and every German will be forever destined to be a slave." Heinzen wanted no traffic with Junkers, bureaucrats, or Hohenzollerns. His fellow German-Americans and his countrymen at home succumbed to the military glories won by German arms under Prussian leadership in three successive wars. Heinzen remained a republican.

The *Pionier* made scores of enemies in the United States by its frequent attacks on the apathy, servility, stupidity, and materialism of the German people. Its editor wrote with disgust about German students, parliamentarians, and journalists. He continued to send revolutionary brochures, including his treatise on tyrannicide, into Germany, and occasionally he received small gifts from American friends to carry on his propaganda activities. He sent his incendiary tracts to the newspapers in Germany and then republished, with obvious delight, the furious reactions of papers like the *Kölnische Zeitung*, which referred to him always as "the mad executioner."

Though Heinzen's name was still well known to many radicals and workers' organizations in the homeland,⁸ the events of history gave little hope for his brand of revolution and republicanism. When Frederick William IV of Prussia died, Heinzen

⁸ It is interesting to add as another proof that Heinzen's name was known in Germany for years after his departure that Wilhelm Raabe, in his novel, *Alte Nester* (Berlin: Grünewald, 1919), refers to Heinzen without any further comment, apparently assuming that his readers would immediately recognize the name.

predicted that his successor would drink blood instead of champagne. He foresaw the coming war over Schleswig-Holstein as early as 1860 and anticipated intervention by France. He regarded the whole controversy as a "swindle" and took no pride in the defeat of little Denmark, in 1864, by Austria and Prussia. He advocated an alliance between England, Austria, and Prussia in order to rid Europe of the dictator Napoleon, and he appealed to all right-minded Germans to support the Poles, Hungarians, and Italians in their efforts to be free.

In the meantime, Bismarck and the king of Prussia, after their victory over Denmark, proceeded to "tear off the mask of dynastic brutality," to undermine the old German *Bund*, and methodically to swallow up the rest of Germany in a Prussian autocracy. Heinzen expected Prussian military aggrandizement to end in the seizure of an emperor's crown for the king of Prussia. He was not befuddled by Bismarck's courtship of the working class by a kind of socialism from above, and he predicted that the Chancellor would betray the workers as soon as it became expedient to do so.

By 1866 all Europe seemed to be mobilizing for war. In Heinzen's opinion all the nations except Italy were robbers. He prophesied the Austro-Prussian War and hoped that it would break up the polyglot Hapsburg Empire, but he was badly mistaken when he predicted that Austria would win the appeal to battle. When the fighting began, Heinzen hoped that it might be the forerunner of revolution. He accepted contributions from the Germans in the United States for a relief fund. Torn between his desire to see Prussia thoroughly trounced and by his dread of an Austrian victory for Jesuitism, medievalism, and barbarism, he found it impossible to choose between Hohenzollern and Hapsburg despotism, and so he contented himself with his old plan to undermine the morale of the army by smuggling propaganda into Germany.

The Prussian needle gun decided the issue, and Heinzen accepted the outcome as another mournful example of might mak-

ing right. He regarded the war as a defeat for progress, culture, and freedom. "Murder is trumps and the most thorough murderer rules the world." For one brief moment, in 1866, he faltered in his unfavorable appraisal of Bismarck. Would that able, energetic leader turn out to be a means to a good end? Perhaps he would invade Italy to destroy the power of the Parisian "bandit." Then French chauvinism would be ended forever, Venetia and Rome would become part of a free, united Italy, and Alsace-Lorraine could be annexed by Germany as a guaranty of the future good behavior of the French, who had betrayed their mission as the chosen people in the struggle for liberty and had become the craven tools of a tyrant. Heinzen wanted to credit Bismarck with preparing the way for German unification by destroying foreign opposition to his plans, but he knew in his heart that the Iron Chancellor was a Junker who could never be a friend of liberty.

Within a month, Heinzen abandoned his more charitable mood toward Bismarck. He might have become a German lion, he wrote, "but he is content to remain a Prussian fox." Apparently, the Chancellor was interested solely in a Hohenzollern Prussia, not in Germany as a whole. Bismarck basked in the sunshine of cheap, patriotic sentimentality as a result of brilliant military victories, and Heinzen realized that there was no hope for German liberalism until the romance of war had faded. He knew also that Bismarck made a German federal republic impossible, and he foresaw a Prussian-Russian alliance, a new move to exterminate the Polish national spirit, and German support for Russian expansion in the Balkans and toward Constantinople.

As the fateful year of 1870 drew near, Heinzen's attacks on Bismarck, the Junkers, the militarists, and the Prussian union of altar and throne grew more violent. The *Pionier* described Bismarck's North German Confederation as an alliance "between a tiger and a dozen lap-dogs" and "a halfway station toward complete annexation" of all the German states. It poured its

invective upon "the Bismarck comedy and the Hohenzollern swindle" and upon the new term, "Supreme War Lord," bestowed upon the king of Prussia. Heinzen believed that war was inevitable and that Bismarck would maneuver France into the position of aggressor. He predicted that England and Russia would remain neutral and that France would find herself without a single ally. He foresaw also that the roll of drums and the booming of cannon would end all domestic opposition to the Chancellor and that the German people would rise to a man to support the Hohenzollern tyrant in Berlin in a war against a foreign foe. With striking realism and understanding, Heinzen appraised the forces mobilizing for war, but, with the unquenchable faith of a republican, he clung to the hope that liberty need not despair even though a German Kaiser might enter the Tuileries. The reaction might lead to revolution!

After Austria's decisive defeat in the Seven Weeks' War of 1866, only France remained sufficiently powerful to challenge the forces working for the unification of Italy and Germany. Napoleon III warned Bismarck against incorporating the South German states in his North German Confederation and insisted that France would demand "compensations" if Prussia continued her policy of expansion. It is a well-known fact that Bismarck was not averse to war with France. Relying on the superiority of a magnificent Prussian army, and on the patriotic enthusiasm likely to be aroused by war against a foreign foe, he could look forward with confidence not only to winning the war but to using the victory to complete the unification of the German Empire. Like many another statesman, he understood the importance of maneuvering one's opponent into the position of aggressor. He counted on French chauvinism and the irritation of the French because of Prussia's sudden rise to power to help set the stage for war. French patriots pushed their reluctant and ill emperor into making demands of Prussia which that nation, under the circumstances, was bound to reject.

The final incident, arising from the vacancy on the Spanish

throne and William of Prussia's refusal to accede to the French demand that no Hohenzollern be permitted to become a candidate, and the clever manipulation of the crisis by Bismarck to bring about a French declaration of war on Prussia, need not concern us here. The Franco-Prussian War began in July, 1870, and culminated, in its first phase, in the French disaster at Sedan, in September. Thereafter, the war continued with the siege of Metz, Strassburg, and Paris by the Germans. Bismarck demanded annexations and guaranties against new aggression, and the republican government which took over when Napoleon fell stubbornly refused to "cede an inch of French soil or a stone of French fortresses." The war ended in a smashing German victory in January, 1871. Léon Gambetta's heroic efforts to save the day aroused the admiration of republicans everywhere but could not change the outcome.

As early as 1852, Heinzen's *Janus* had considered the hypothetical question: What should the Germans do if the French, under Napoleon III, should march across the Rhine? At that time Heinzen had advised a policy of passive resistance, of neither opposing nor helping the enemy. Let the French come in and overthrow the German princes, Heinzen reasoned; the Germans have nothing to gain or lose which would be worth a single drop of their blood. Let there be no fight, as in 1813 and 1815, on behalf of German princelings, and do not help the king of Prussia to extend his autocratic rule, no matter what fine phrases of liberalism and patriotism he might proclaim. In the end, Heinzen thought that the French and the Germans together would revolt against their rulers and perhaps combine forces against the Russian czar. He favored a union of France and Germany, even under temporary French domination.

Heinzen hoped for a peaceful outcome of the diplomatic maneuvers of 1870, but he clearly foresaw what was likely to happen. He saw France mobilizing and admitted that she deserved to be chastened, in spite of Bismarck's provocations, because of her chauvinistic spirit. War was declared by the

"bloody bandit," and Heinzen could only bemoan the fate of the people of France and Germany who had to suffer for the aggressiveness of their rulers. If only France were a genuine republic, commented the *Pionier*, then one could wish her victory! Heinzen reviewed the military resources of the two powers and concluded that Germany would win. He appealed for a million dollars, to be raised in America for the care of German wounded, and he himself contributed forty. He suggested making France harmless for the future by adding Alsace and parts of Lorraine to Germany, returning Nice and Savoy to Italy, leveling all the border forts, seizing the French fleet, and limiting the size of the French army. But he added that, at the end of the war, the German army should demand a constitutional assembly elected by universal suffrage and a people's militia to support a program for a democratic Germany. He wanted an end to the French shouts of "La Gloire." He accepted the battle cry, "Down with Napoleon!"—but not in order to shout "Hoch der Kaiser!" Heinzen wrote with a vigor and a freshness in 1870–71 reminiscent of his best period in the 1840's.

By September, 1870, the last French field army had been defeated and Napoleon was a captive of the Germans. He had not died a "hero's death" on the battlefield but had surrendered to "his brother in slaughter," and thus "the executioner of Rastatt became the savior of the executioner of Paris," as they stood together at Wilhelmshöhe "on a mound of corpses which they had built." Heinzen hoped for an immediate revolution in France, with Ledru-Rollin as republican dictator, and an offer of peace. Thereupon, he thought, the French might march to the Alps and the Pyrennees, to help Italian and Spanish republicans. If that were done, how could the king of Prussia refuse peace to these three republics? Surely the German people would not be so despicable as to become the executioners of their republican neighbors! Heinzen hoped also that the French republic would voluntarily return the provinces which France had seized from Italy and Germany and thus prove that the curse of chauvinism

had been finally purged from the French body politic and that that nation was again ready to assume her historic role in leading mankind to liberty and international brotherhood.

France did establish a republic, and from that moment on Heinzen insisted that the peace terms must give that republic a chance to survive. He still favored the return of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany, because these provinces had been German originally and as a guaranty of peace, which would end French temptation to expand toward the Rhine. He was ready to approve the transfer of Belgium to France and of Holland to Germany. As the war dragged on, however, the *Pionier* referred more often to "Germany's disgrace" in refusing to come to terms with the French republic. Heinzen wanted no march on Paris but an immediate treaty, and, if Germany continued the war, he hoped that the French might drive her armies back to the Rhine. He withdrew his earlier suggestion that Alsace-Lorraine be ceded to the Germans. He denounced William of Prussia as "the bloodhound," appealed for a revival of the French spirit of 1793, and concluded that if there were a spark of decency left in Germany, she would withdraw her forces to the Vosges Mountains. Heinzen lauded the courage of the French and their stubborn refusal to surrender, and when Paris finally fell, "in the year of disaster, 1871," he published a moving appreciation of the valor of France in the battle to save her freedom and her political life, though bleeding from a thousand wounds. Gambetta became one of Heinzen's heroes, and Bismarck the archenemy, who had deliberately bled France white in a vain effort to get rid of "the poison of republicanism."

German-Americans had made a political issue of the sale of surplus arms to the French republic by the United States government. Heinzen defended it as a legal transaction and suggested stamping on every box of munitions going to France the words, "Vive la république." He denounced American neutrality in a war between autocracy and republicanism as "a policy of cowardice and immorality." He predicted that the

French would seek revenge against Germany for generations to come and added that they would be fully justified in nursing their hatred of a nation which had unnecessarily continued the war against the French people. "The Germans won and deserved to win as long as they were in the right," he wrote early in 1871; "as murderers of republicans they deserve to be chastened and driven back to the slave pen from which they came." In a letter written in 1872 to a fellow-journalist in Germany, Heinzen announced his preference for the "Marseillaise" rather than "Die Wacht am Rhein" and went on to say: "The victory over the hereditary foreign foe has no value for me without a victory over the far greater hereditary foes within, of which the worst is servility. . . . I can congratulate Germany for having chastened French chauvinism, but German chauvinism is even more disgusting to me than French, because it is fed by servility and insolence."

Germany's brilliant victory over France, and the sudden rise to power and glory of the Bismarckian Empire, was strong wine for German-American heads. Fritz Anneke, for example, chief of artillery of the revolutionary forces in 1848-49, refugee and ardent liberal, wrote enthusiastically to his wife on July 21, 1870, about the German march into France and was ready to forgive all the faults of the Prussian king and to abandon, temporarily at least, his former convictions that German unity must be preceded by liberty. "History wishes it otherwise," he wrote; "it says too plainly: Through unity to freedom! . . . Germany will become great in peace as it was in war." His wife Mathilde had less faith in the "Hero King" and "saw to the bottom of the Prussian business," but even she wrote proudly of the German triumphal march on Paris, where, "it is to be hoped, conditions of peace will be dictated to the proud Frenchmen."⁹ The *New Yorker Staatszeitung* and the *Illinois Staats-*

⁹ Henriette M. Heinzen, in collaboration with Hertha Anneke Sanne, "Biographical Notes in Commemoration of Fritz Anneke and Mathilde Franziska Anneke" (manuscript vols.; Madison, Wis., 1940), pp. 239-40, 242-43, and Appendix.

zeitung assured their readers that Germany would achieve freedom under the Kaiser. Freiligrath made his peace with the new order and wrote patriotic poems, and Ruge, by a liberal use of Hegelian dialectics, managed to accept the Germany of Bismarck. Even Karl Blind, long a contributor of foreign news to the *Pionier*, tried to discredit the French republic, and Schurz, Kapp, and Körner almost fawned on the aged Prussian king, now elevated to an imperial throne.

Great peace celebrations were held by the Germans in New York, Chicago, and other cities. In Belleville, Illinois, in 1870, Gustav Körner, leading liberal of the 1830 emigration, made the main address at a mass meeting in which he described how "tiger-like, the French government is ready to spring on an unguarded Prussia." He extolled Germany, "with all its weaknesses," as "the most humane, the most just, the most genial and noble of all peoples." A ladies' bazaar at Belleville yielded \$1,600, and in the United States as a whole \$600,000 was contributed for German relief. In Chicago a parade with floats representing the great periods in German history from the days of Tacitus, the Crusades, and the Thirty Years' War to Kaiser Wilhelm I, Moltke, and Bismarck, and with Turner, singers, and other organizations bringing up the rear of the procession, passed in review before the mayor, city council, and judges of the city.¹⁰

It requires little imagination to understand the obsequious idolatry and adulation poured out upon Bismarck and the Hohenzollern Kaiser at these celebrations. The great majority of American Germans swelled with pride because of the efficiency of the German army and the unification of their fatherland. Many who had accused Napoleon III of chauvinism now became chauvinists themselves. They emerged from their political and social isolation in the United States, shook off their sense of inferiority as adopted citizens, and glibly proclaimed their "mis-

¹⁰ See *Memoirs of Gustave Koerner, 1809-1896*, ed. T. I. McCormack (Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1909), II, 509-12, 530.

sion" in America. Earlier interest in the democratization of Germany evaporated even among many of the "Forty-eighters," as they enjoyed to the full the emotional jag of victory celebrations and the accentuated class consciousness of their group in America.

Heinzen did not lose his head in the excitement of the German triumph over France. Fearless and uncompromising as ever, he ridiculed the antics of his German-American colleagues. "The all-highest in Germany, that is, the bloodhound in Berlin and his Chancellor, cannot sneeze without the whole German-language press in the United States shouting 'Gesundheit.' " In scathing terms he attacked his fellow German-Americans for their "sentimental servility" and "hollow patriotism" as manifested in their public demonstrations in 1870 and 1871. He advised them to send their congratulatory resolutions to the German liberals who were still fighting for freedom but not to the king of Prussia and his chancellor. He singled out Schurz for special condemnation; he analyzed and condemned the resolutions adopted at various mass meetings and remained steadfast in his conviction that the new German Kaiser was a congenital tyrant and deserved a tyrant's fate. He saw no chance for democracy in a divine-right Prussian monarchy buttressed by compulsory military service and a well-disciplined bureaucracy. The war remained for him a "naked, barbaric, mass murder." He denounced the German-American press for its servile compliments to the German Kaiser, on whose fingers "there still sticks the blood of the martyrs of 1848-49," and he characterized President Grant's immediate recognition of the French republic as his "most praiseworthy act." He announced that he would repudiate his German blood if Germany persisted in humiliating the French republicans and committing "the greatest disgrace in history."

Heinzen's attack on German megalomania and boastfulness, his rigid adherence to his earlier principles, and his persistent attacks on militarism and on the artificial stimulation by the Ger-

man government of hatred for the French lost him most of his remaining friends. He was virtually excommunicated by the majority of his fellow-Germans as a Francophile and a traitor to his people, and the *Pionier* lost subscribers by the scores. On the occasion of its eighteenth birthday in 1871, the editor wrote that the last few months had nearly ruined the paper. "No other act," he added, "has so aroused and embittered the Germans as a whole against the *Pionier*, and threatened its very existence, as its defense, in 1870, in a republic, of the cause of republicanism against despotism." In dire financial straits, but with spirits undaunted, Heinzen continued to write the truth about Germany as he saw it.¹¹ He tried with might and main to keep the republican spirit alive. He continued to hope for the assassination of the German king-emperor, whom he characterized as "Tyrant, Executioner, Murderer and Bloodhound." He refused to attend all dinners given by Germans in honor of the new empire, or any of its representatives, though some of his radical friends had no scruples of conscience about accepting such invitations. Bismarck remained for him a charlatan, a "robber captain" in the employ of a "robber dynasty," a royalist, a Machiavellian, a Junker, an enemy of liberty, and a man utterly without moral standards.

Nothing in the events of the decade following 1871 gave Heinzen much hope for the future. He no longer expected to see republicanism established in Germany during his lifetime. The

¹¹ His editorials continued to stir up repercussions in Europe. See, e.g., *Berliner Kladderadatsch*, February 20, 1874. The *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* called him a "Thersites." In 1872 Heinzen published anonymously *Ein neues Wintermärchen*, the tale of Heinrich Heine returned to earth. It was sent in small, cheap editions into Germany and provoked angry rejoinders from papers like the *Stuttgarter Beobachter* and the *Rheinische Kurier*. In the *Wintermärchen*, Heine revisits Germany. At Frankfurt he asked for the president of the republic and found instead Bismarck and the Kaiser, a population of cowardly sycophants, and a nation of cannon-fodder instead of thinkers. He proceeded by way of Leipzig to Berlin. He found literature had become the tool of priests and soldiers; veterans begging on the streets; the Reichstag a farce; men arrested for thinking; and the maid Germania transformed into the whore of Prussia. In the end, he returned to hell, where at least a man's thoughts are free.

German people had been "emasculated" and were becoming more and more servile. He denounced the heartless expulsion of French teachers and officials from Alsace, and saw Germany become more and more chauvinistic. He predicted that it would soon embark upon world conquest. He contrasted Germany with England, a land without a "menacing army" and yet with "more significance and influence than the German Empire," simply because "her moral force derives from her liberty, imperfect as that may be." Heinzen foresaw the possibility of a second Franco-German War, provoked by French *revanche* and German megalomania. He watched his fatherland become a Hohenzollern barracks without a friend in Europe and predicted that France would win the next war. He deplored Germany's new interest in colonies and in a navy, and he noted the alarm in England and Russia because of German expansion. "All of Germany is poisoned by Prussic acid," he concluded. He repudiated the National Liberal party as a mere tool of Bismarck and not a "liberal opposition" at all, and he believed the Social Democratic party would lead to communism and the class struggle. Even the Kulturkampf which Bismarck waged against Heinzen's ancient enemy, the Roman church, left Heinzen unmoved. He regarded it as a thinly disguised attempt to substitute a new pope for the old one, who would be under a Prussian helmet and support the Hohenzollern throne. He pointed to the crushing tax burdens of the German people and the miserable lot of the working class, and he was profoundly distrustful of Bismarck's social legislation.

Heinzen continued to receive many letters from Germany. Some came from liberals who refused to bow the neck to the Hohenzollern yoke. Some asked for shipments of his publications, for distribution in Austria and Germany, where their circulation was specifically forbidden by the courts. Heinzen tried to help political refugees re-establish themselves in the United States, and he invited fellow-sufferers to come to this land of freedom. By one of life's little ironies, Brentano, whom Heinzen

had castigated mercilessly as the traitor of 1848, turned out to be one of the few who agreed with him in deploring the reconciliation of the "Forty-eighters" with the Kaiser, Bismarck, and the new empire, proclaimed at Versailles. Burying the hostility which he had nursed ever since their first meeting at Rastatt, Heinzen wrote in praise of Brentano's courageous defense of principle.

Heinzen longed to see his homeland once more before he died, but he refused to set foot upon soil ruled by a Hohenzollern despot. He knew that even if Germany were liberated from monarchical rule, he could not go back, for he realized that a refugee would have few rights and that no one would respect his opinions. He would be received by his own people as a stranger and a foreigner. He understood what many refugees have failed to comprehend—that, in order to become a leader in a new day, one must have remained at home and shared all the misery and sufferings of the people. The world had become a madhouse and a jail. Heinzen had only his principles, and his sense of humor, to see him through his last years. In 1878 he published an editorial in the *Pionier* entitled "Homesickness, by a Man Who Has No Home." He wrote movingly of the beauties of his own German Rhine country. Nature was as bountiful with her blessings as ever, but the people had changed.

Was du besassest, ist verschwunden,
Was du erhofft, stellt sich nicht ein,
Von Allen, die du hast gefunden,
Sind nur noch die Begrab'nen dein.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICANIZATION

THE HEAVY GERMAN IMMIGRATION OF THE MIDDLE nineteenth century, to which Heinzen belonged, came at a time when it was bound to produce certain experiences and reactions among the German-Americans which, by the mere accident of events, tended to divide them from their American neighbors as a group apart. One reason for this German-American isolation was the role of the "Forty-eighters" and others of their kind who assumed the leadership of German-American communities throughout the United States. Proud of a cultural heritage which they were quick to contrast with the standard of living on the raw American frontier, these leaders arrived at the very moment when a vigorous struggle between "Continentalism" and "Puritanism" was imminent. The Continental viewpoint of the Germans constituted a source of friction with their American neighbors and inspired violent attacks on the German element during the nativist agitation before the Civil War.

Many Germans, and especially the intellectuals among them, took keen delight in flaunting their Continental tastes in the face of Americans whom they regarded as little better than barbarians—men without art, music, culture, or refinement, who were suppressed and crushed by the bigotry of Puritanism. The conflict between the champions of two diametrically opposed philosophies of life was especially acute in the Middle West, and neither party to the struggle distinguished itself for tact or

tolerance. To many of the leaders of the German immigration, a compromise between these two cultural patterns was intolerable. One might remain a German, or one might become completely Americanized, but to sink to the cultural level of a "German-American" meant surrender to a hybrid status inferior to both the German and the American. Heinzen, in one of his earlier poetic effusions, expressed this viewpoint in these oft-quoted lines:

Sich amerikanisieren
Heisst ganz sich verlieren;
Als Teutscher sich treu geblieben
Heisst Ehre und Bildung lieben;
Doch lieber indianisch
Als deutsch-amerikanisch.

In the 1850's, at the very moment when this intellectual and cultural leadership of the German immigration asserted itself, the United States experienced its worst manifestation of nativism, culminating in the bigotry and violence of the Know-Nothing period, just before the Civil War. This revival of nativism was, to a considerable degree, due to the heavy Irish and German immigration after 1848 and to the abuses which came to light in the elections held in the metropolitan areas of the United States, where there was abundant evidence that the melting-pot was boiling over. American democracy had not yet learned the processes of orderly elections, and immigration and naturalization frauds were numerous. Conservative American property-holders protested that unrestricted immigration was responsible for polluted elections and higher taxes, that it jeopardized the institution of private property, and that it brought to the United States European paupers who had to be supported at public expense. American workmen were convinced that this "pauper labor" was destroying their standards of living and accused employers of deliberately importing immigrants from abroad in order to keep wages down. In addition, the nativism of the 1850's had a strong Protestant, anti-Catholic tinge. A new

crop of pamphlets appeared to arouse the friends of American institutions against the contaminating dangers of a Catholicism which received its mandate to fight Protestantism from a foreign potentate in Rome. Because of their strong religious faith, the Irish bore the brunt of these charges, but German Catholics were not immune from these attacks.

More important, however, for our present purpose, were the accusations against the rationalists, socialists, atheists, free-thinkers, and desecrators of the Puritan Sabbath, who constituted a considerable portion of the German immigration. To evangelical American Protestants, Irish papists and German radicals seemed equally reprehensible. Among the "Forty-eighters," commented the *North American Review* in 1856, there are "too many of those turbulent, restless spirits, who are always evoked from obscurity by civil commotions . . . they stamp kingcraft and priestcraft with a common brand of infamy. The great majority of the wealthy and educated are atheists or radicals." The American Republic was being exposed to the "irreligious influence of thousands of German infidels."¹ It must be added that the Germans added fuel to the spreading flames by openly and tactlessly expressing their contempt for the untutored "barbarians" and fanatical "Methodists" who championed the Calvinist Sabbath. Blaring bands, Sunday picnics, dances, parades, and noisy German beer-halls deeply offended many Americans and challenged the long-established customs of many a community.

The crisis resulting from these fundamental antagonisms produced repercussions which have been felt to the present century. Aggressive German leadership and militant native Americanism solidified the German element in the United States, kept them on the defensive for several generations against the normal processes of Americanization, and crystallized their cultural isolation. American politicians aggravated the situation by angling for German votes with a type of flattery which gave the Ger-

¹ LXXXII (1856), 266.

mans a false sense of their political importance. The Germans were not seriously concerned with plans to Germanize the United States, but they did want to be let strictly alone. As a matter of fact, the cultural life of the Germans in America was never adjusted to that of modern Germany. What the Germans really perpetuated in the United States was a culturally static *Deutschtum*, which was concerned not so much with the issues that exercised modern Germany as with *Turnvereine*, singing societies, bowling and pinochle clubs, and all those other things which German-Americans describe so sentimentally with the all-embracing term, *Gemüthlichkeit*.²

Heinzen, as an immigrant, was *ipso facto* deeply interested in the problem of immigration. As early as 1852 he had advocated the creation of a federal department in Washington to end the conflicting jurisdictions of the states and to deal with immigration as a national policy. He continued in the *Janus* the campaign which he had begun in the *Deutsche Schnellpost* against the miserable hospital and housing facilities available to the immigrant on his arrival in this country. He attacked the petty graft and exploitation going on in New York at Castle Garden, the port of entry, and he tried to arouse the Germans to file formal protests against these abuses. He warned the newcomers against real estate promoters and land "sharks" and fraudulent farm associations formed to take advantage of their gullibility, and he denounced their treatment on shipboard and on American railroads. He also criticized the Germans for being so negligent about completing their naturalization, and he insisted that Germans returning to their homeland with an American passport must be protected by the full authority of the United States government against attempts by Prussian militarists to force them to perform their period of military service.

² See, on these matters, John A. Hawgood, *The Tragedy of German-America* (New York, 1940); Ernst Feise, "Colonial Petrification," *German Quarterly*, XIII, 117-24; and Dieter Cunz, "Die Deutsch-Amerikaner," *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht*, XXXIII, 343-48.

Heinzen was aware of the frauds in voting and naturalization perpetrated in the larger cities of the Atlantic seaboard, and he admitted that they gave just cause for alarm on the part of nativists who were honestly concerned with the preservation of America's democratic institutions. After the Civil War, in 1869, he advocated a penalty of ten years in prison and loss of citizenship for illegal voting, and twenty years for misleading a noncitizen to vote illegally, and he was ready to deprive of their citizenship all those who knew of frauds and refused to report them. At the same time, however, he opposed a plan to deny Orientals the right to become naturalized, on the simple ground that he believed naturalization should be available to all free men. He was genuinely disturbed by the contracts made by transcontinental railroads and other employers to import Chinese coolie labor, but his sense of justice would not tolerate discriminations against honest and able Chinese workers for the benefit of unskilled European immigrants.

During the last decade of his life Heinzen often reflected upon the dangers of unrestricted immigration. "What would one say," he asked in 1869, "to the warning that this republic, grown great because of immigration, may also be destroyed by immigration?" He pointed out that most immigrants came to the promised land not because of idealism but on account of empty stomachs. Most newcomers had been subjects of monarchical governments, and few really understood the difference between that type of government and a republic. He concluded that it was high time to consider how immigrants were meeting the tests of democracy and to emphasize quality and not quantity. "Free immigration," he wrote, "is not a natural right of man," and every state has the obligation to police its borders. He would admit Chinese immigrants who could introduce tea and silk culture in California, but he would exclude coolies, even if that meant the abrogation of the Burlingame Treaty with China.

By 1873 the *Pionier* not only favored selective immigration

and a sharp reduction in the total number of immigrants to be admitted but suggested that a complete stoppage might be beneficial to the United States. Heinzen argued that the Negro problem was still unsolved—why invite additional problems? He advocated the exclusion of “raw, uncouth” Irish Catholics, and he was even more severe in his criticisms of the uneducated, uncultivated, servile immigrants from monarchical Germany. With increasing anxiety he pondered the problem and wondered whether the United States had not been too generous too long. Would it be able to assimilate its heterogeneous hordes of immigrants without serious danger to republican institutions? Heinzen suggested abolishing the five-year residence requirement for naturalization and substituting a searching and comprehensive examination in the history, government, and geography of the United States and in the English language. Anyone passing these tests should be admitted to citizenship; those failing the examination should be barred, no matter how long they might have lived in the United States.

It is obvious that Heinzen viewed the whole problem of immigration with more intelligence and balance than many men who were immigrants themselves and leaders of their immigrant groups have been able to do. This does not mean, however, that he compromised with nativism and Know-Nothingism. He hated the bigotry and fanaticism of the nativists of the 1850's and reacted with unusual forcefulness when the Germans, as a class, were attacked by American politicians and publicists. When these criticisms were based on the charge that the Germans “imported agnosticism,” he doubled his efforts to persuade his fellow-countrymen to qualify as voters, so that they might retaliate at the polls against such attacks from the leaders of American Protestantism.

By 1856 the Know-Nothing party figured prominently in the elections. Millard Fillmore was their presidential candidate, and Heinzen described him as a traitor to the North and “a silver gray incarnation of the doughfaces.” In a number of the north-

ern states the Know-Nothings were rather closely identified with the new Republican party. The Democrats exaggerated that alliance for their political advantage and raised the question in 1856 of how the foreign-born could possibly identify themselves with a new party, dominated by nativists and narrow-minded Puritans. It is against this background of political maneuvering that the "two-year amendment" of Massachusetts, already referred to, and imposing additional requirements upon naturalized citizens for voting and office-holding, must be considered. The Germans rightly attributed that amendment to nativist influence upon the Republican party in Massachusetts; and a political revolt, on a national scale and of major importance, was avoided only at the last moment by adroit leadership in the Republican national convention of 1860.

During the campaign of 1856, leading papers like the *Buffalo Demokrat* and the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* sought to prove that the only genuine friend of the immigrant was the Democratic party and that no one could be a Republican without being a Know-Nothing also. To this Heinzen replied heatedly that were he an American he would be a Know-Nothing, to help drive Catholics away from the ballot boxes and out of public office, as well as all immigrants who voted for slavery. In his excitement he added that he was not yet ready to be naturalized but that, if he had a vote, he would cast it for any Know-Nothing who opposed the twin evils of slavery and Jesuitism. He pointed out that the connection between Know-Nothings and Republicans was being stressed by Democratic, German-language papers solely for the purpose of throwing sand in the eyes of their readers, and he called attention to the fact that the Republicans had repudiated nativism in their platform of 1856 and that the "best Know-Nothings" had become Republicans simply because of their opposition to the extension of slavery. When Heinzen's old friend, Struve, for the moment the publisher of the *Soziale Republik*, organ of the German *Arbeiterbund*, took a different course in 1856, Heinzen turned on his erstwhile

companion in revolution to argue that one year's additional "testing time" for naturalized Americans was preferable to an indorsement of slavery. However, he advised the Germans to form a party of their own, in order to exercise pressure upon the Republicans and to secure just treatment, and he proposed the adoption of his Louisville platform of 1854 as the best antidote for Know-Nothingism.

It was shortly after this discussion in the press that his own state of Massachusetts, still in the grip of the Know-Nothing craze, took up for consideration the "two-year amendment." Heinzen was furious because the Republicans in the legislature supported this discriminatory proposal, and the *Pionier* immediately called a public meeting to discuss ways and means of defeating the "Republican Know-Nothings." Heinzen knew that the German vote in his state, as elsewhere, hung in the balance. Protests against the Massachusetts amendment poured in from German organizations in Philadelphia, Bridgeport, Newark, New York, Toledo, Chicago, and other cities. The Boston Germans met in the Turner Hall on March 3, 1859. Heinzen was elected president of the gathering and made one of the principal addresses; Louis Prang was one of the vice-presidents. An Irish Democrat from Framingham appeared to urge the Germans to vote Democratic. Instead, the assembly adopted resolutions sponsored by Heinzen's colleague, Douai, denouncing the Republican party and advising all persons of foreign birth and free spirit to form an organization pledged to support only that party which "does not measure civil rights by place of birth, or human rights by color of skin." Heinzen urged support of the Republicans in state elections wherever possible but favored a united opposition in the national campaign. He hoped for a new party under German leadership, although he knew it would be a difficult task to rouse the Germans of the West to political action. The *Buffalo Telegraph*, the *Toledo Express*, the *Sandusky Intelligenzblatt*, and the *Turnzeitung* joined the *Pionier* in demanding separate political action by the German group.

The Philadelphia *Freie Presse*, on the other hand, accused Heinzen of having ambitions to become a political leader, and the St. Louis *Westliche Post* advised the German Republicans against being led around "by the nose" by a man whose sole ambition was to become "a great man."

Heinzen advocated a national convention to launch a new party. Hecker, Körner, Willich, Stallo, and others opposed his plan, and so did influential papers like the *Cincinnati Volksblatt*, the *Illinois Staatszeitung*, the *Indianapolis Freie Presse*, the St. Louis *Anzeiger des Westens* and *Westliche Post*, and the New York *Abendzeitung*. Undaunted by this formidable opposition, the *Pionier* proudly listed the newspapers which favored a German convention—the New York *Demokrat*, the *Kriminalzeitung*, the *Wisconsin Demokrat*, the *Cincinnati Republikaner*, the *Belle-viller Zeitung* (Illinois), and the *Soziale Republik* of Struve, who had by this time accepted Heinzen's plans for separate action by the Germans. Other influential papers, like the Cleveland *Wächter am Erie*, the *Davenport Demokrat*, and the *Michigan Journal*, remained neutral. Heinzen also sought to enlist the support of William Lloyd Garrison and expressed his astonishment that anyone who had so courageously defended the rights of the colored man should "pass over in silence a violation of the rights of white men." Garrison printed his reply in the *Liberator*. He condemned the Massachusetts amendment but pointed out that, as a matter of conscience, he never participated in an election.

In due time the Massachusetts legislature passed the amendment. The furor among the Germans and the Irish, and the resolutions of censure adopted by state Republican conventions in the West, only convinced the legislators of the righteousness of their purpose. Heinzen petulantly awaited the reaction to his proposal for a German convention. Schurz, with whom he had discussed the problem in Boston, wrote from Milwaukee, on May 18, 1859, fixing the entire blame for the amendment on Governor Banks. He urged the Germans to take revenge on

him but argued strongly against any scheme to organize his fellow-countrymen into a separate party group. The letter was couched in cordial terms and ended "with friendly greetings." Strangely enough, it had its intended effect. Heinzen agreed to await developments.

The *Pionier* was not hopeful about the possibility of obtaining adequate guaranties against nativism from the Republican national convention in 1860 and demanded that Congress fix uniform suffrage requirements for all the states. Heinzen returned to his earlier suggestion of a separate organization of radical Germans to present an ultimatum, along with another from the abolitionists, to the Chicago convention. This ultimatum, he thought, should demand outright repudiation of the Massachusetts amendment, a reduction in the requirement for citizenship from five to three years, and an additional residence requirement of two years for voting. The Republican leadership extended itself to make amends. Beer flowed in streams at the Chicago convention, apparently to convince the Germans that Republicans were not Puritans, and a "Dutch plank" was written into the platform. Though drawn in general terms and without specific reference to the Bay State, it made it clear that the party did not approve of two kinds of citizenship. The plank had the unanimous support of the German delegates, but it did not satisfy Heinzen. The latter did not support the Republican candidate in 1860, partly because of the two-year amendment, but more because the platform stopped short of pledging the abolition of slavery.

Know-Nothingism disappeared almost as fast as it had come. It accomplished little of practical significance, and it was lost sight of in the slavery controversy and the appeal to arms in 1861. During the Civil War the United States opened its doors wider than ever to all immigrants who wished to come. Heinzen, on the other hand, believed that it would be well to close the doors to the Irish and the criminal class. He insisted that such a policy would be neither nativism nor Know-Nothingism

but merely a sane attempt to keep out undesirables, and in this category he included Catholic priests and their flocks. He blamed the immigrants for much of their trouble and especially for accepting the status of inferior "voting cattle" and surrendering the equal rights to which they were entitled. Know-Nothingism lingered on in Massachusetts, and as late as the summer of 1860 a picnic held in Boston to raise funds for a German school was attacked by nativist rowdies. In the spring of 1861 the Massachusetts legislature repealed the two-year amendment.

Somewhat akin to nativism, at least in the minds of foreigners, was the so-called temperance crusade, a misnomer for total prohibition. High-minded American reformers tried hard to change the deeply ingrained drinking habits of the Continental stocks that lived among them, and their activities served to focus attention on the utter incompatibility of German and American tastes and temperaments. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union had the temerity to create a special department to do missionary work among the Germans and distributed "temperance" leaflets, including a paper known as the *Bahnbrecher*, in German communities.

Heinzen was chronically opposed to all forms of compulsion and particularly in the matter of personal habits. The "Puritan" and "Methodist" cultural pattern represented a concept of personal liberty which, like most Germans, he felt it his duty to combat. In an early issue of the *Janus* (in 1852) Heinzen had published a leading article on "The Temperance Rage." He admitted that the temperance crusade was indicative of certain moral and social evils and could not be cavalierly dismissed as mere humbug and fanaticism. Although he appreciated the concern for the welfare of others manifested in a reform movement of this kind, he advised striking at the causes of the liquor evil rather than legislating against its results. He wanted to educate men to be temperate in all things. He favored drastic legislation against poison liquor and wished to encourage the use of wine

in place of brandy. He appreciated the connection between intemperance and unemployment and deplored the lack of adequate recreational facilities to keep men out of saloons. But he branded prohibition as an unjustifiable usurpation by the state in the realm of personal liberty, and he believed that legislation against alcoholic beverages would be followed by other abridgments of individual rights.

In 1855 Heinzen returned to the subject in the *Pionier*. He credited the prohibitionists with an honest desire to strike at the brutality, crime, pauperism, and misery that existed in the human rookeries of many eastern cities, where "Irish hordes [were] unable to restrain themselves." He agreed that the reformers, by advocating state intervention to improve the health and living conditions of the people, might be the unwitting instruments of social revolution. Heinzen knew that men without jobs sometimes drowned their idleness and boredom in drink and that, without education and a chance for wholesome recreation, men found it difficult to curb their appetites. He understood the intimate connection between the liquor business and corrupt local politics, and he pleaded for a better police force. He denounced the barkeeper who sold liquor to drunken men and favored severe penalties for saloonkeepers who kept indecent places of business or sold adulterated products. He wanted liquor licenses to be issued only to men of respectable and dependable character, and he favored closing all saloons on election days. He advocated legislation to permit women to sue for damages due to the intoxication of their men, and he approved heavy fines for public drunkards. He regretted that the American saloon had become a man's monopoly and that women and children were left at home. Pointing out that some of the worst opponents of woman's rights were also the greatest heroes of the liquor business, he argued for the introduction of the Continental beer garden to replace the American saloon. In 1874, when the famous women's temperance crusade broke out with fanatical zeal in Ohio, in

what Heinzen called a form of "praying lynch law," he blamed the preachers for inciting the women and deplored the effect such female fanaticism might have on the movement for equal rights for women. But "teetotalism" was incompatible with his concept of "the free life of the individual." The state might control men's relations with each other, but it should not interfere with the right of a man to get drunk or even to kill himself, provided his conduct did not endanger the rights of others. Heinzen disliked the hypocrisy, deceit, and spying that accompanied prohibitory legislation. He refused to believe that man is the only animal who must be afraid of himself or who is incapable of learning self-control, and he opposed chaining the free because others had become the slaves of their habits.

Heinzen hated "blue laws" and Sabbath legislation. He was irked to find Boston—"the cradle of liberty"—enforcing Sunday laws that prohibited a man from leaving his home or made it impossible to use the library on that day. He believed the Republican party after the Civil War was degenerating into a party of "temperance torture" and "Sunday tyranny"; and in 1874 he again seriously suggested another convention of the radical democracy, after the pattern of the Cleveland meeting ten years earlier, to protest against temperance fanaticism and the revival of the Know-Nothing spirit. In the last analysis, however, Heinzen was content to leave the cause of temperance to the schools, the press, and to oral argument. No one ever denounced intemperance among the Germans more forthrightly than the editor of the *Pionier*.³

In 1866 Heinzen wrote that one might hate Germany and leave it but that one could not deny one's nationality, which is deeply rooted in every man's ancestry, his schooling, and the literature and history of his people. Heinzen was proud of the best in German culture and ready to defend it, along with his

³ See Heinzen's lecture, "Ueber das Wasser," an interesting blend of satire and science delivered in 1852 at Hermann, Missouri, the center of a flourishing German wine industry, and reprinted in *Teutscher Radikalismus in Amerika* (n.p., 1867).

fellow German-Americans, whenever narrow-minded "Puritans" or fanatical "Know-Nothings" attacked their way of life. In many respects he regarded the United States as a culturally backward and undeveloped nation, but he was equally ready to point out the shortcomings of his German countrymen. As a result, he offended both the native-born and the naturalized Americans.

In many of his lectures dealing with the role of the German element in America, Heinzen called attention to the bickering and personal jealousies that marked the life of almost every German community in the United States. He satirized the profusion of talk that never led to action and the German-Americans' obsession with material things to the exclusion of everything else. He found educated Americans far more sensitive to liberty and freedom than his own people, better informed on public affairs, and more receptive to new ideas. The Germans, he lamented in 1852, would "rather spend a dollar on beer and cigars than a penny for a newspaper." Americans were wont to praise the Germans as farmers, singers, flower-gardeners, and artisans and to extol their good nature and *Gemüthlichkeit*. Heinzen wished to make them known for their intelligence and their radical thinking.⁴ The *New York Tribune* listed "skepticism and materialism" among the "bad effects of the German immigration." These were precisely the qualities which Heinzen valued. He maintained that radicals like himself had made a great contribution by shaking the Germans out of their lethargy before the Civil War and by awakening them to the idealism of the antislavery crusade. He regarded the leaven of radicalism, based on reason and science, as the only effective antidote for "the intellectual know-nothingism" of Americans as a whole.

The German immigrant, as a rule, loved his beer gardens, his Sunday dances, his picnics and theaters. He cultivated the so-called joys of life in a plethora of organizations—singing soci-

⁴ See *Der Deutsche Pionier* (Cincinnati), VII, 431, for a review of Heinzen's lecture on "Böse Tugenden und gute Untugenden," by H. Rattermann.

eties, drama clubs, *Turnvereine*, and sharpshooting, bowling, and card clubs. Fredrika Bremer, in her description of the Cincinnati of the 1850's, wrote: "The Germans live here as in their old Germany. They are *gemüthlich*, drink beer, practice music." On Sunday evenings "they congregated with their pipes and beer, 'over the Rhine,' to talk and argue and sing the songs of the fatherland." In Milwaukee bands played nightly as German families sat for hours, after the Continental fashion, drinking their beer and listening to the music. At the least provocation, German-Americans arranged picnics, celebrations, and festivities, outdoors or in the lodge room or *Weinstube*. German singing societies serenaded their friends with "Ständchen," and German burghers played skat and pinochle and "66" over their beer mugs and their sausages and sauerkraut, or traveled off to distant cities for sharpshooting contests and skat tournaments. Great *Volksfeste* commemorated the anniversaries of German heroes and literary figures. In 1861, for example, when the New York Germans celebrated their third annual Steuben festival, eleven military companies, thirty-five German singing societies, several Turner and dramatic societies, and numerous other German organizations of various kinds participated in the festive occasion. Some years later, when a Hecker monument was dedicated by the Cincinnati Germans, the monster parade included, among other societies, the Schimmelpfennig Encampment; the Germania, Harugari, Druid, and Herwegh *Männerchöre*; the Cincinnati *Turngemeinde* and its singing auxiliary; the Badischer und Deutsch-Oestreichischer Unterstützungsverein, the Deutscher Krieger Verein, the Schwäbischer Verein, two German-Swiss societies, several other benevolent societies, the organization of German butchers, a Gambrinus society, and a military company.

Most of the Germans loved this *Vereinsleben* and *Bierbänkelei*. Heinzen hated it—as mere philistinism. In the strongest terms he denounced the "emptiness and purposelessness" of the life of the German middle class, who lacked both initiative and

courage. Dilettantes in everything, they were lost, according to Heinzen, in a "dangerous 'romanticism'" which made them superficial in all they did and unfit for serious discussion of political and cultural matters. He described Milwaukee as a city of "music, wine, beer and tobacco," the home of philistines, but not the "German Athens of America." He ridiculed the German's love for the foaming amber fluid and the "free beer" which was a necessary part of almost every German gathering. Could the Greeks have celebrated their Olympic games with beer mugs in their hands? he inquired. How many German singing societies, military companies, and *Turnvereine* would survive if parades and beer were abolished? The beer glass had become the center of German community life; free beer their chief political issue. There was much talk about "personal liberty" and "the dignity of man," but Heinzen insisted that, with few exceptions, German organizations in the United States had lost all interest in the higher things of life.

Heinzen loved music, and, although he did not know too much about it, he occasionally tried his hand at writing criticisms of operas and concerts. But he had little respect for the hundreds of German singing societies which existed all over the United States wherever Germans had settled in any appreciable numbers. Heinzen loved the music of the German masters and was genuinely moved by some of the folk songs of his native land, but he contended that many German singing societies were so engrossed in "beer evenings," the dedication of new flags, and in other meaningless ceremonial occasions that they had no time left to devote to things worth while. "The larynx has displaced the head," he commented; "male singing has become a substitute for manliness," and German-America is developing into a vast "singing school." Wherever Heinzen stopped to lecture, he usually was serenaded by German singers, but few came to hear his addresses and still fewer were ready to sign his revolutionary manifestos. The parade of New York Germans at the time of the Humboldt celebration Heinzen de-

scribed as "conceived in beer and buried in beer." He ridiculed the sentimental invitations to annual *Volksfeste* and *Sängerfeste*, with their standardized references to "the joys of the festivals of flowers and song," and his comments on some of the musical renditions on these occasions were anything but complimentary.⁵ In place of concerts and public festivals, Heinzen would have preferred celebrations to honor Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, and Humboldt; but he was forced to conclude that "beer is the only national theme" of German social gatherings in the United States.

Heinzen had the same low opinion of German lodges, such as the "Odd Fellows," Druids, Red Men, Harugari, and Freemasons. What had they done to advance the cause of enlightenment, humanity, and culture? Their sole interest was in the art of beer-drinking. A friend suggested that Heinzen could get many new subscribers for his paper if he would join the Masonic fraternity. He replied scornfully that liberty and humanity were not dependent on the secret ritual of Freemasonry, that the fraternity had reigning princes among its members as well as other "unworthy brothers," and that it was contaminated by too much Christian doctrine. He could not understand how a man could participate in such "insane humbug," "with an apron around his belly and a blindfold over his eyes." In his *Editoren-Kongress* he satirized the whole German lodge system by inventing a fantastic ritual and the sacred, mystic word "Haruhurigaririburglari," and described a meeting of the brethren, which ended in a call to the police to suppress a revolution in an insane asylum.

Heinzen never indulged in "hurrahs" for the German fatherland, or forgot its shortcomings, because of a foaming glass of beer or a sentimental folk song. He chided his countrymen for their crudity and vulgarity and for their failure to create even one public garden in America in which educated men and wom-

⁵ "Biervedummte und verbummelte Brüll und Schrei-Vereine unter denen auch ein Paar Singvereine waren."

en could escape the saloon and the beer garden and while away an hour over a glass of wine or in strolling among the flowers. He tried, with little success, to interest the Germans in the United States in a German university or a teachers' seminary. He did not want his countrymen to become completely submerged in Americanism. On the contrary, he hoped Americans would become Europeanized by digesting and absorbing the treasures of German science and learning. He frequently urged pressure upon existing parties by the Germans as a united group in the interest of reform, but he was eager to have the Germans become politically Americanized and exemplary citizens.

The events of 1870-71, and the reaction of the Germans in the United States to them, induced Heinzen to make "some patriotic observations" about the whole German-American problem. Had the Germans really abandoned their love for the Kaiser when they became naturalized Americans? Apparently the majority had come to the United States as "subjects" of the Kaiser and had remained so, for they made their living in a republic and drank toasts to a monarch! He poured out his sarcasm on men like Schurz, Stallo, Kapp, and von Holst, who talked about being "citizens of two worlds," and he favored legislation to deprive anyone of his American citizenship the moment he revealed monarchist views. He would let such men talk as they pleased, for his devotion to freedom of speech would not permit him to do less—but he would deprive them of citizenship and suffrage. He had serious doubts about the patriotism of some of his fellow-Germans in the event of war with the fatherland and wondered what would happen if Bismarck should seek colonies in the Americas in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. He would have welcomed a plebiscite on this issue and announced that all who supported Germany "deserve to be hanged." "Every German subject in America is a perjurer," he insisted, "for he has received his citizenship papers by swearing a false oath." Why remain here "to befoul your

nest"? "If you are so enamored with the fatherland," he queried, "did you seek American citizenship merely to use it in order to denounce the land of your choice?" Such straightforwardness did not win readers for the *Pionier* or increase Heinzen's popularity among his fellow German-Americans. In Indianapolis, in 1871, at a celebration of the "Concordia" society, copies of his paper were publicly burned, and subscribers were urged to cancel their subscriptions.

Among all the organizations introduced into the United States in the course of the last century by the German immigration, Heinzen perhaps had a right to expect most support from the *Turnvereine*. In general, they represented higher levels of intellectual interests and broader cultural objectives, and they were more actively concerned with the perpetuation of German radical thought in the United States than any other group, with the possible exception of the *Freimännervereine*. The Turner movement traced its origin to the dark days when Napoleon I dominated Prussia. It stressed both physical and intellectual progress—"a chainless body and a fetterless mind" and *mens sana in sano corpore*. Hatred of all oppression, whether political, ecclesiastical, or intellectual, and sensitivity to freedom and liberty were among the fundamental principles of the *Turnvereine*. Their members met in the Turner halls not merely for physical culture but to listen to lectures and discussions on history, government, and science. They supported reading-rooms and libraries and frequently took a lively interest in radical reforms, including freethinking societies and socialism. The first Turner societies were organized in the United States as part of the "Forty-eighter" movement, beginning with an organization formed by Friedrich Hecker in Cincinnati in 1848, where the first Turner Hall in the United States was dedicated in 1850. By 1853 the North American *Turnerbund* included sixty societies and supported a periodical known as *Die Turnzeitung*. *Turnfeste*, great competitive gymnastic tournaments, have been held in the United States since the early 1850's. They included, in addition

to individual and group gymnastics, parades, concerts, pageants, balls, and theatrical performances.

Heinzen did not like the festivities and parades of the Turner any better than those of other German societies. He ridiculed their "pseudo-military games, their student drinking," their passion for flags and "brotherhood," their "giant swings" and their performances on the parallel bars, their "exaggerated guild spirit," their silly greetings of "Gut Heil," and the German "Gruss und Handschlag." Heinzen could not be persuaded that any of these manifestations of the "Turner spirit" contributed one iota to the development of free, intelligent human beings, and he deplored the waste of money on parades which might be spent on revolutionary brochures for Germany. He admitted that it was desirable to remain physically fit, but he thought noisy parades, gaudy uniforms, and magnificent athletic displays were, in reality, obstacles to intellectual progress. He discovered that Turners went to parades but not to lectures; that they used their bodies but hated to use their heads; that they wasted their money on beer and spacious halls and torchlight processions but spent very little for a good cause. They played at soldiering, without sensing its utter incompatibility with the cultivation of the free, human spirit, and they refused to become soldiers of the revolution. They did not read radical papers, had ceased being the "phalanx of liberty," and had degenerated into typical "philistines in uniform." He pointed out that the Albany *Turnverein* in 1859 had a library worth \$80, and flags valued at nearly \$500. On the other hand, Heinzen stood ready to praise the Turner on those rare occasions when he thought they deserved commendation. He lauded the New York *Turnverein* in 1860, for example, for raising \$300 for a Garibaldi fund and took great pride in the Boston Turner who acted as a bodyguard for Wendell Phillips when the latter was attacked by a mob at an abolitionist meeting.

Heinzen's strictures on the shortcomings of German-American societies were severe enough, but they were as nothing com-

pared with his diatribes against the German-language press in the United States. With a few honorable exceptions, he regarded German newspapers as subservient imitators of the American party press. They were edited without distinction, by men whose command of German style was sadly deficient, and who produced their copy largely by translating poorly from English dailies. Heinzen was particularly furious when his fellow-editors, who regularly denounced the *Pionier*, quoted choice bits from the pen of its editor without so much as suggesting their authorship. Heinzen reprinted "models of German style" from other papers and spared none in his ridicule of their wretched, journalistic jargon. He believed that most German editors were mere party henchmen, eager for jobs and political influence, and utterly unscrupulous.

The *Pionier* pointed out that many German-American papers were owned and operated by "businessmen" who had been unsuccessful in other ventures. Their publications were described as "a planless confusion of announcements, anecdotes, reports of fires and murders, and local news" and reprints of antiquated selections from cheap literature, chosen without reference to "principle." Because the publishers strove primarily for profits, they tried to please their "readers," "like a shoemaker fitting a shoe"; and, as a consequence, every subscriber thought he had the right to dictate to the editor, and the latter, with no convictions of his own and no interest in reform or progress, dished up predigested food which his readers could swallow without mental effort. Heinzen declared in 1858 that there were not a dozen editors of German-language papers in the whole United States whom he would recognize as colleagues. "A fine kettle of fish," he exploded, "when every German Irishman who can buy a couple pounds of type, or every linguistic criminal who can undertake a campaign against the German mother-tongue, or every philistine who likes to see his name in print as a publisher, or every political speculator who maltreats the press for business reasons"—can call himself *my* colleague! Such men are

"ordinary barbarians," he added, who convert "the temple of the mind into a stable for animals."

So much for Heinzen's troubles with the Germans in America. What of the Americans? Heinzen's first impressions of the United States were quite unfavorable. The people were "raw" and uncouth, the system of justice bad, the public safety neglected, the religious life sterile, politics corrupt, poverty on the increase, and the United States Constitution a very imperfect document. In a moment of extreme depression Heinzen once referred to the United States as "Malheurica." He poked fun at the American rocking-chair and at devices to stimulate the national vice of tobacco-chewing, which he described as an art that was truly mastered only when one could spit sixty times a minute on clothes and furniture. He disliked the American custom of standing up at a bar and of getting an "eye-opener" of brandy every morning to start the day. He ridiculed the American habit of putting one's hat on crooked and of putting the feet on tables or windows. He attacked American business methods, the hypocrisy of American politics, and American ecclesiastical and political "humbug."⁶ He deplored the fact that Americans had no folk festivals, except the "anarchical noise of July 4, firemen's parades, and military exhibitions." American sports left Heinzen completely baffled, and pugilism seemed to him but a new form of rowdyism, "a human bull fight."

The fact remains, however, that Heinzen recognized and appreciated the virtues of American democracy. He had viewed the United States from afar as the model for his republican dreams, and as early as 1852, in spite of his sharp criticisms of American culture, he had described his adopted fatherland as the freest on earth, whose educated citizens were more sensitive to liberty than the majority of German immigrants. "The true greatness of America," he wrote, "consists in its freedom for

⁶ See an address delivered in Dayton, Ohio, on "Wunder der Industrie" and printed in *Jamus*, July 28, 1852.

intellectual combat, and this is a virtue which outweighs many an evil and places this country, in spite of all its failings, above that of any other nation on earth."

Unlike many European critics of American civilization, Heinzen did not believe that Americans were "dollar mad." He liked to contrast the generosity and benevolence of the Yankee toward public enterprises with the stinginess of the Germans. Pointing out that Americans bought far more books and read more periodicals than the Germans, he likened the culture of Boston to the best in Europe. He admired the "practical" qualities of the Americans and defended them against charges of being heartless or avaricious. He demonstrated that no other nation on earth spent so much for education or supported private and public charities for the unfortunate so generously, and he recognized the American desire to own property as evidence of a desire to be independent. In spite of blue laws, which he so cordially disliked, he contended that Americans were less fanatical than other people. He wrote admiringly of Theodore Parker, Emerson, and Lowell, whose rationalism helped to undermine New England orthodoxy. "The only hope of this country," so ended an article in the *Pionier* on November 28, 1858, "is and remains the Yankee."⁷ This was strong language, and the *Milwaukee Herald* promptly attacked Heinzen as "a fanatic of Yankeeedom" and a "singer of odes to corrupt Americanism."

One of Heinzen's best public lectures was an address on "The Germans and the Americans." He gave it for the first time in the Boston Turner Hall under the auspices of the *Turngemeinde*, and it was widely circulated in several editions. An analysis and summary of that address may well conclude this

⁷ In one of his poems he observed:

"Trotz Dummheit, Rohheit und Schlechtigkeit,
Hier ist das Wort von Ketten befreit;
Und so lang hier waltet das freie Wort,
Treibt keine Verzweiflung den Freien fort."

discussion of Heinzen's views on the German immigrant and his Americanization.

Heinzen began by defining Americanism in terms of the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. He denounced the Know-Nothing spirit which demanded that immigrants should shed all their memories of the land of their origin and betray the rich cultural heritage of their fatherland. "Americanization" to the Know-Nothing, he commented, apparently means that the immigrant must be immediately transformed into a "Be-Nothing"; must substitute tea for Rhine wine; candy, pie, pork and beans, and Boston brown bread for native cuisines; firemen's parades for outdoor picnics; muddy streets for beautiful promenades; and churches for attractive and comfortable taverns. "Come down from the Alps," he wrote, "and raise your eyes to the Alleghenies; forget the Rhine of the Middle Ages, so you can learn to admire the modern Hudson; eradicate Berlin and Heidelberg from your memory, and fall in love with New York and Cambridge; throw Goethe and Schiller into the fire, and read the Bible and Miles Standish; bury Hutten and Borne and revere Webster and Everett; turn away from cathedrals . . . to red brick houses . . . , turn your back on Kaulbach and Lessing and admire art shops where paintings are sold in order to sell frames." Obviously, if Americanization demanded such a complete change in the manner of living of the immigrant, no one of Heinzen's intellectual caliber would wish to become an "American." Intelligent immigrants have always resented hothouse methods of acclimatization, which can have no other effect than to produce an inferiority complex and rob this nation of cultural contributions which would greatly enrich American civilization.

Heinzen pleaded for a rich variety in American life. He wanted not uniformity but harmony among all American racial strains, obtained by a common devotion to common ideals about the rights of man. America's greatness, he insisted, depended on the preservation of national and individual variations, so that

the best might be extracted from every culture in order to enrich America. The world needs, he wrote, "the spirited liveliness and the fermenting impetuosity of the Frenchman; the all-pervading intellectual richness and the thoroughness of the German; the poetic beauty of the Italian; and the practical sense and restless energy of the Anglo-Saxon." Changing the figure somewhat, he added that here in the United States the national flowers of each immigrant group could be blended into a huge and surpassingly beautiful bouquet. "We cannot be natural Americans," he continued; "we will not ape Americanism, and we dare not be inferior to the Americans. Therefore let us be Germans without Teutonism, and Americans without Americanism, merely American citizens with a German nature, who will find their Americanization in the unhampered development of true humanism, in the atmosphere of freedom guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence."

Heinzen spoke of "co-ordinating" Americans and Germans but not "subordinating" them. He would leave the future to decide who would be *primus inter pares*. Germans were impractical theorizers, lacking in unity and decisiveness; talkers and not doers. "Criticism without action is an Irish quality," he wrote; "action without criticism is American; criticism and no action is German; but criticism and action is what Germans and Americans acting together may accomplish."

The comparisons Heinzen made between Germans and Americans generally turned out in favor of the latter. He thought American women were superior in loveliness, courage, and intelligence. He admired the restless energy and practical sense of the Americans. He believed the Germans were too sentimental and the Americans too naïve, and he continued to stress that America needed the yeast of German revolutionary radicalism, which only German refugees could provide.

Enamored by the pseudo-science of phrenology, popular at the time, Heinzen indulged in some absurd comparisons of the skulls of the American, French, English, and German people.

He concluded that the American chin, with its strength and aggressiveness, must be blended with the German skull, distinguished for its power of thought. He noted the absence of a national literature and thought that the writing of American history was virtually at an end, for there was so little left to write about. America had no past, save for the Indians! "American literature, like American wine, still tastes of the earth," and a culture cannot be created *ex abrupto*. He advised borrowing from German music and literature in order to enrich American cultural life, and he suggested that, as every German should learn English, every American should learn German, to the end that Americans might become "spiritually German," and Germans "politically American."

For Heinzen the United States was a great experiment in liberty and humane culture and a process forever unfinished. Here he had planted the banner of freedom, when his hopes were dashed in Germany. He urged his fellow-immigrants to cherish their literature, art, music, and science in America, "in the spirit of freedom," and not as "merely manure in a foreign cultural field," to be eventually "absorbed." He pictured his adopted fatherland as growing steadily in culture and in territory, absorbing new elements from all over the world, and developing a unique civilization. Liberty and humanitarianism were dead in Europe. Heinzen would revive them here! He would have America ruled not by "Americans," in the sense of the nativists, but by intelligence, humane culture, and the principles of liberty.⁸

⁸ The lecture is best available in *Teutscher Radikalismus in Amerika*, Vol. II (1871); or in *Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois* (Chicago, 1915), XV, 145-80.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE CLOSING YEARS

KARL HEINZEN WORKED HARD ALL HIS LIFE AND seldom could afford competent help to lighten his tasks. Editing the *Pionier* single-handed for a quarter-century was in itself no small accomplishment, even for a man of his iron constitution, and Heinzen did many other things that made heavy demands on his time and energy. Like most Germans, Heinzen set great store by "Erholungsreisen," but he could afford few vacations, and the number of pleasure trips he made were few indeed and of short duration. His meager pocketbook and the exacting demands of a one-man paper made it impossible to be away very often.

In 1857 Heinzen made his first visit to Germania, a real estate development of the Pennsylvania Land and Farm Association in Potter County, Pennsylvania, which was to become his favorite vacation spot. The association advertised regularly in the *Pionier* and seems to have given the editor a small plot of land in lieu of a cash payment. The little German settlement consisted of a thirty-acre clearing, a few stores and a hotel, a village population of eighty, and an additional three hundred settled on near-by farms.

It was Heinzen's custom to send regular reports of all his trips, in the manner of a travelogue, to the *Pionier*, and the accounts of his experiences in the forests of Potter County make delightful reading. On his arrival he was usually serenaded by

the little singing society of Germania. He lived at the home of a Bavarian radical and went hunting and fishing with his new friends. He reveled in the simple pleasures of his sylvan retreat; he visited the neighboring farmers; and he rejoiced that the village had no church. In 1867 he brought with him two of the ladies of his Roxbury household. He enjoyed the simple, wholesome fare of the Hotel Schwarzbach, far removed from telegraphs and news of the world. He wrote in the manner of a young romantic about his return to man's primitive pleasures, and he seems to have been completely rejuvenated. He traveled by wagon and ox team to near-by places; he lectured the farmers on soil erosion and conservation; and he visited Oleana, the community sponsored by Ole Bull, the famous Norwegian violinist. He was greatly disturbed to find German women engaged in hard labor in the fields and advised the people to spend their money on their women and children rather than on a church.

For the next three years Heinzen got no farther than Central Park in New York on his vacation trips. In 1872, however, he returned to Germania to get relief from Gilmore's Music Festival of "bigger and better music," which held Boston in its spell for several weeks, and to recuperate from "summer complaint" and "music complaint" and a presidential campaign. He had three women companions this time, and the party proceeded via the Fall River line to New York and thence by railroad and wagon to their destination in Potter County. Heinzen described his travel partners as "one an American who speaks German; another a Pole who speaks English; a third a German who speaks French."

In the long record of Heinzen's life there is no record of illness before 1872, except one or two minor ailments to which he paid little attention. In 1872 he complained of lumbago. Two years later he was unable to work for several weeks because of illness. The first serious illness of his life overtook him in 1877, when he was sixty-eight years old. For days he had a fever of

104 degrees, and for weeks he could do no work. After six weeks, however, he wrote to his friend Schmemmann that he had completely recovered, thanks to his "strong constitution." He had lost nearly thirty pounds in five weeks, and for a long time he could do little except walk in his garden and direct the making of wine from grapes cut from his own vines. By Christmas he was able to enjoy a deer which friends sent for his table, but the following March he still complained of swollen ankles.

There were other signs that revealed that the aging editor could no longer drive himself as hard as usual. The *Pionier* for 1878 and 1879 contained more and more "filler," quotations from others, and less from his own pen. Many of the issues for which he had fought so zealously during his lifetime no longer seemed quite so urgent. Dr. Zakrzewska, in her somewhat deficient English, wrote to George Schumm: "At present, there is no burning question for which to fight. Slavery is done with; the negro come to his rights. The woman question is acknowledged to have rooted, and must grow with slow growth. Religion has cast off the mantle of Puritanism, and must slowly yield to Science. The Temperance question is not in danger to become of a political value. The only question which is of importance is the Labor question, and this has not crystallized sufficiently to inspire special championship."

Heinzen, with all his stubborn insistence upon rationalism as an antidote for sentimentalism, always was homesick for his native land. As a matter of fact, the only Germany he knew was the Rhineland. He knew the country around and below Cologne and Bonn well, because here he had grown up and done his early work. As a young man in his thirties he had gone up the river to Mainz. He had visited Wiesbaden, Frankfurt, and Mannheim, and with von Fallersleben and Itzstein he had gone to Heidelberg. He left us a vivid description of the Heidelberg castle, of the happy hours he spent with his companions in the romantic old university town, and of an unforgettable excursion to the Frankenthal. When he visited Rhenish Bavaria, he found

it "under the heel of police and priests," and the ruins of its castles convinced him that the "obscurantism of the Rhine diminishes only at the Dutch border, where it gives way to materialism," but he could not resist the beauties of the countryside or the convivial hours spent with his friends at the "Vier Jahreszeiten" in Dürkheim. In one week, as a young man, he had visited half-a-dozen fatherlands—a striking comment on the disunity of Germany—and, of all these little states, he liked Baden best. This was "the fatherland" that Heinzen carried with him into exile. He never saw Hamburg, Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden, or Munich.¹

In 1874, while still in vigorous health, Heinzen resolved to revisit Europe. His passport, No. 40276, signed by Hamilton Fish, described him as sixty-five years old, six feet two inches tall, with a high forehead, blue eyes, medium nose and mouth, round chin, light-color hair, round face, and healthy complexion. Leaving von Ende in charge of the *Pionier*, he departed on July 2 on the steamer "Caledonia" for Europe. Impervious to criticism, he took "three maiden ladies" with him as traveling companions. The trio consisted of Dr. Zakrzewska, Julia Sprague, and Mary Louise Booth. During the absence of the travelers from Boston, the faithful Mrs. Heinzen helped with the publication and distribution of the *Pionier*, and Rosalie, one of the doctor's sisters, cooked for her and managed the household.

The files of the *Pionier* for 1874 give a detailed account of Heinzen's experiences. He profited from the ocean voyage but found the sea as monotonous as ever, and he was bored by passengers who thought it was their function to entertain their fellow-travelers. The first instalment of his travelogue came from Glasgow. From there, the party went to Edinburgh by way of Loch Lomond. Heinzen found the Scottish lakes far less

¹ See "Ausflug eines wild gewordenen preussischen Landwehroffiziers in das deutsche Vaterland," in *Politische und unpolitische Fahrten und Abenteuer* (Mannheim, 1846), I, 179-232.

interesting than the Swiss, and the highlands so barren that he resolved never again to say "My heart's in the highlands, my heart is not here." The European system of universal "tipping" made him angry, and he contrasted it with the willingness of Americans to do favors for nothing. He enjoyed Edinburgh because of its cleanliness and beautiful parks, but he deplored the fact that the latter were not open to the common people.

In London, Heinzen visited some old friends, saw the sights, and then moved on to New Haven and Dieppe and Paris. In the French capital he began to complain that his traveling companions were so easily exhausted that they interfered with his progress. He took them to the Place de la Concorde and went alone to the Bois de Boulogne, the Tuileries, and the Vendôme monument, rejoicing that such symbols of despotism had been demolished. Passing through the lovely Burgundy countryside, and on to Switzerland, the party reached Zurich by the end of July. Heinzen hardly recognized the city which had once been his asylum, and he had great difficulty in finding the places where he had lived. But Zurich was still the same pleasure-loving city with its Sunday outings, music, and folk festivals. Heinzen and his ladies went on picnics into the mountains, traveled around Lake Lucerne, "the most beautiful in the world," to Flüelen, Vierwaldstättersee, and up the Rigi by cable car, where Heinzen found the view disappointing and, probably just to be contrary, refused to get up to see the sunrise, watching it from his bed.

In the museum at Zurich, Heinzen indulged in a journalistic debauch by reading all the leading German papers, including Bismarck's *Germania*. He concluded that the Germans had degenerated into "political eunuchs," and it was then that he announced his decision not to set foot upon German soil. He would not be the guest of despots and helots. His heart yearned for a glimpse of his fatherland, but he would not be muzzled, and he could not remain silent. So he remained in Switzerland while his friends made the trip down the Rhine. Heinzen went instead to Ufnau, to revel in the memories of his hero, Hutten, "pioneer

of German exiles"; and he concluded that, were Hutten alive today, he could live only in the United States, and there he would probably be hated like the editor of the *Pionier* and be proud of his enemies.

Heinzen made a foot tour to Rapperswyl, as he had done in the company of Freiligrath many years ago. In Zurich he called on Dr. Nauwark, who had worked with him on *Die Opposition* in 1846. He visited several American friends who happened to be there, but most of his acquaintances of former years were gone. His traveling companions returned from Germany, happy to be back on Swiss soil, impressed with the beauty of the Rhine country, and depressed by their contacts with the police and the "swinish" students of Heidelberg.

The party moved on to Bern, and on to Interlaken and to Grindelwald, to see its famous glacier, but Heinzen stayed in the hotel garden, enjoying the mountain scenery and refused to walk anywhere to see "a dirty ice crust." Thence he went to Lauterbrunnen, to see a waterfall, and to the Giesbach, which he loved. At Geneva, from which Heinzen had twice been expelled, he visited the grave of his old friend Galeer and found it marked by a marble bust, with the inscription "Liberté, Solidarité." The beauties of Geneva impressed him as much as ever, but he could find neither his former friends nor his former residence. By steamer the party proceeded down the Rhone Valley, to Sierre, and back to Martigny. They found Evian and Vevey and Montreux most attractive but with their natural beauty marred by the tourist trade. At Sion, Heinzen visited the castle ruins. He explored Castle Chillon on Lake Geneva, inspected the old Roman and Savoyard fortifications and the dungeons and torture chambers, and philosophized again about man's inhumanity to man and about the new "robber barons" of his age who maintained huge standing armies and practiced the new form of persecution known as *lèse majesté*. Heinzen climbed Mount Blanc and likened the chain of peaks he saw from the top to a huge sprocket turning another planet. The

party returned through lovely valleys to Geneva by way of St. Gervais. They strolled over the bridges across the Rhone and along its banks and stopped to rest on Rousseau Island and to ponder on all the great spirits who had dwelt in this neighborhood. Heinzen contemplated writing a history of Geneva in terms of the biographies of the men who had lived and worked in that famous city.

From Switzerland the travelers went to Italy. They visited Turin, Verona, Padua, Venice, and other leading cities. Because he knew no Italian, Heinzen stopped only at German hotels. He was in high spirits when he wrote about Venice, its women, and its mosquitoes. He described the gondolas as "black coffins" and marveled at the skill of the gondoliers, as he went down the Grand Canal, lined with palaces and other monuments of departed glory. He examined the interior of the palace of Prince Giovanelli with close attention to minute details. He strolled about at night on the Square of St. Mark's and found it crowded with "affected fools and poets" who were up all night and a-bed most of the day. Heinzen preferred his sleep to "Venetian nights." He explored the Palace of the Doge and St. Mark's Church and studied the Byzantine architecture. He concluded that Venice was living on its past; it had too much gold and sculpture, too many mosaics and frescoes, and too many signs of ruin and decay.

In Turin, Heinzen called on one of his intellectual mentors, Moleschott, and found him a frank, modest, and lovable man. The landscape of vineyards and mulberry trees delighted him, and he wrote enthusiastically about the many fine-looking men whom he met and admitted that here even soldiers and priests had intelligent faces. Heinzen disliked all art that was in the service of kings or churches, but he visited a number of Italy's famous cathedrals. He strongly preferred Verona to Venice and derived great pleasure from tracing its evolution, by means of its architectural monuments, from Roman antiquity through the Middle Ages to modern times.

Heinzen was delighted to get back to Paris for a longer stay. He called it the "center of civilization" and "the life of the world." Its beauty made Italy pale into insignificance, and its art was not "the servant of religion." Even the Church of the Madeleine was in pagan style. Heinzen wandered about the city as though he were in a Greek world of joy and beauty. He understood the Frenchman's deep love for his country. He liked to see "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité" inscribed on public buildings and monuments, and he was happy to see the Louvre and Luxembourg palaces accessible to the common people. In spite of their military past, he was genuinely fond of the French people. He liked to see soldiers on leave fraternizing with the people and to detect other signs of *égalité*. He recognized deep shadows in the French picture, but he summarized all his impressions in one sentence: "If Paris were destroyed, it would be a loss for the whole human race; if Berlin were destroyed, it would be a loss only for Hohenzollern liars and robbers."

On September 31 Heinzen was back at his desk in Boston, looking fine and "feeling ten years younger." The *Pionier* of October 14 carried a notable editorial, entitled "Home Again." In spite of an interesting and pleasurable trip, the editor admitted that he had been homesick for the United States and that he had returned with a new concept of "home." He was happiest when reunited with his family and friends. Heinzen's "spiritual home" was America. Here he had "free air" to breathe and "freedom to work." In spite of his intellectual and cultural connections with the Old World, "everything [he] saw in Europe struck [him] as strange and even hostile." Even in Zurich and Geneva he had "wished for a piece of America." He became sentimental about a group of Americans who gathered around a little organ in the ship's salon to sing "Home, Sweet Home" as their vessel entered the Hudson River, and he advised "anyone who is weary of the United States, [to] go to Europe to learn to appreciate it again."

It was fortunate that Heinzen revisited Europe when he did,

for his physical powers were fading noticeably. The *Pionier* of February 19, 1879, carried a revealing article on rheumatism, that mysterious ailment with which that generation described many maladies which defied more accurate diagnosis. Three days later, however, Heinzen celebrated his seventieth birthday in exceptionally good spirits. Friends came from New York and Boston to surprise him with a supper party and to present him with two silver cups, and toasts were drunk to the venerable leader of radicalism in great number, some in poetic form. Telegrams came in from Detroit, Sauk City, Milwaukee, New Braunfels, and many other cities. The singing society of the Roxbury *Arbeiterverein* serenaded the guest of honor, and Heinzen received many birthday gifts, among them a present of three hundred dollars.

The birthday celebration stimulated Heinzen to reminisce about the venture nearest his heart. He expressed his warmest thanks to all those who had worked gratis to secure and hold subscribers for the *Pionier* and who, by their efforts, had kept the paper alive; and he singled out for special mention Schmieding and Schmemann of Detroit and Lieber of Indianapolis, who had collected several hundred dollars annually, an amount which proved decisive on more than one occasion in keeping the paper out of bankruptcy. Heinzen also paid a warm tribute to his wife on this occasion. She had learned to set type in the critical first years of their publishing enterprise, when it was impossible to employ a typesetter. An intelligent, warmhearted woman, utterly devoted to her husband's work, Mrs. Heinzen had attended to the mailing of the *Pionier*, kept house for her husband, and made all her own clothes, bedding, towels, and other household necessities. According to the testimony of her husband, she never bought a new hat but with her skill as a milliner refurbished the old ones until they looked like new. She did all of Heinzen's laundry, mended their clothes, made her husband's vests, and in every respect met the most exacting standards of a thrifty German *Hausfrau*. She was extremely practical and extremely

skilful with her hands. What she saved by her frugality she saved for the *Pionier*. She was completely self-effacing and lived only for her husband. In spite of hardships and sacrifice, she was always in good spirits and full of the joy of life. She enjoyed fun and never missed an opportunity to have it, provided there were no costs involved. In addition, she collected appreciable sums for Dr. Zakrzewska's hospital, although she had no funds of her own to contribute.

In the summer of 1879 Heinzen began to complain seriously of failing health and of a certain mental "slackness" and deterioration. Finding it increasingly difficult to fill the columns of his paper, he feared that he had already "written himself out," and it worried him greatly lest the *Pionier* "go out like a burned-out lamp." He would have preferred to see it fail for purely financial reasons. He wrote to Schmemann that he was suffering from spells of dizziness and that recently he had had to be helped to his home from the post office. He resolved to try sea baths and a trip to the mountains, but it was obvious that his will-power was no longer sufficient to carry him along, and he seems to have sensed the fact that the end was not far off.

In September, 1879, Heinzen wrote a long editorial on "Health," in which he admitted that he had never known before how much health had to do with a man's opinions and conduct, and for the first time he confessed that he might have judged others unfairly. For the first time, also, he seems to have realized how much some men had accomplished in spite of their frail bodies. "Poverty doesn't matter," he wrote, "provided one has health. But if a man lose his health, then he and his philosophy have reached the end." Among his papers he left a fragment entitled "Todesahnung." In it he expressed the hope that he would not slowly "decay" but be broken off suddenly, like a strong tree in a storm. "I am ready; I keep my accounts in order, so that the final balance can be drawn at any time. . . . Nothing but conflict and storm, but my spirit is unbowed, . . .

though there is many a pain in my heart, and I still have much to tell the world."

On November 26, 1879, the *Pionier*, now in the care of the devoted and able George Schumm, reported that its editor had suffered a stroke of apoplexy and was seriously ill. Heinzen rallied sufficiently to announce plans to merge the *Pionier* with the *Freidenker*. Though he recovered his speech, and his hearing was as good as ever, his whole left side was completely paralyzed. He knew that another shock was imminent and that the next might mean the end. He mustered sufficient strength to write several affectionate letters and to dictate short articles for his paper. In his own shaky handwriting he prepared a will witnessed by Julia Sprague and Dr. Zakrzewska, making his wife the sole heir of the few possessions he called his own. The last number of the *Pionier*, before it was submerged in the *Freidenker*, contained the usual foreign correspondence, and "Notizen," articles on "just popular representation" and cremation, the concluding chapter of a serial novel, *Die schönen Amerikanerinnen*, and the editor's farewell, which was primarily a plea to old subscribers who had deserted him for one reason or another during a quarter-century of controversy and conflict to return to the fold.

Though nominally an associate editor, Heinzen was able to write very little for the *Freidenker*. His first contribution was entitled "Passionsbetrachtungen" and was written from a "martyr's bed." He described his afflictions in detail and as scientifically as possible. He was "half a corpse," yet fully conscious. He could not sleep, nor even turn in bed, and his psychological suffering was worse than the physical pain. Yet he knew that thousands had suffered more and without the comfort of the loyal friends that were eager to lighten his last days. Heinzen reviewed the famines, wars, and epidemics of the world's history and pondered on how mankind, not content with the sufferings imposed by nature, insisted on inventing new terrors. He pleaded for sympathy for humanity as a whole

and hatred for those who caused its pains and promised that his last words would be: "Down with him who even mentions the word war!" His old brother in combat, Pater Oertel of the *Katholische Kirchenzeitung*, deplored Heinzen's lack of the consolations of religion, and the latter roused his energies sufficiently to reply, jocosely, that he would be willing to be converted if he could be guaranteed the ability to sleep and sufficient use of his leaden leg and arm to enable him to get about with a crutch.

On February 15, 1880, Heinzen published an editorial in the *Freidenker*, entitled "The Old Friends," to thank veteran radicals like George Schmieding, Schmemann, Lieber, A. Lucas of Pekin, Illinois, F. Schäfler of Sandusky, and others who were no longer alive for their support of his life's work. He admitted that he had made many enemies, but he took comfort in the thought that he also had won many staunch friends. The German press, as a whole, continued to malign the stricken editor, although he was virtually at death's door.

In August, 1880, the Boston *Turnverein* serenaded the invalid at his home and sang "Abendglocken" and "Schweizerheimweh." Carl Dörflinger of Milwaukee, who was visiting Heinzen at the time, appeared on the veranda to make an address and to express the thanks of his host, who was too crippled to leave his room. Schmemann also was there. Heinzen had invited him and Schmieding for a farewell visit, in a letter full of gloom about his suffering and appreciation for a devoted wife who refused to abandon hope for his recovery. He promised to muster all his strength for one last visit with his friends and to provide a bowl of May wine to be drunk in the garden. And he ended his letter, strangely enough, with the English, "God bless you."

The friends came from Detroit, and Schmemann described this farewell to "a modern Prometheus" in the *Freidenker*. He found Heinzen unable to write and being hauled about in a wheel chair by a giant Swedish male nurse, but intellectually

keen, able to read, interested in having others read to him, and considerably mellowed. Heinzen was wheeled out into the garden for a picnic supper, and he talked long with his friends about Ruge and Struve and Herwegh and Freiligrath. Schmemmann visited Forest Hills Cemetery, where Heinzen expected to be buried under a weeping willow tree; he inspected Dr. Zakrzewska's hospital; and Heinzen's son showed him through the establishment of Louis Prang and Company. When his visitors departed, Heinzen charged them with many affectionate messages for his radical friends everywhere.

By October, Heinzen was certain he could not recover. He called the members of his household to his bedside, demanded pen and paper, and in an almost illegible hand (it took him nearly two hours to write seven lines) he penned a final request to Schmemmann to have his works published for the benefit of Mrs. Heinzen. He handled a pen only once more—to sign a petition for woman's suffrage.

On Saturday, November 13, 1880, Boston papers carried the notice of the death of Karl Heinzen on the preceding day, and the *Transcript* referred to him as "the foremost pioneer of free thought." On Sunday a meeting was held in the Turner Hall to appoint a committee to plan a memorial service and to request all Germans to attend the funeral.

Funeral services were held at two o'clock in the afternoon of November 15 at the "Rock Garden," as Heinzen's home was known. Hundreds of Turner assembled at their hall and attended the exercises in a body. The singing section of the *Turnverein* and the Orpheus Chorus took part in the program. S. R. Köhler, editor of the *American Art Review*, made the principal address. He referred to Heinzen's "rough and blunt exterior," and his unmovable steadfastness, "in the conviction that he alone had caught sight of the absolute truth." But he also spoke of his martyr spirit, of his hatred of compromise, and of his "imperative endeavor for the universal." Though forced to "quit the field ere the seed ripened," he had "sowed abun-



HENRIETTE SCHILLER HEINEN (WIDOW OF
KARL HEINEN)

dantly." He had lived and died alone. He had on occasion carried his polemic too far, without sufficient consideration for honest opponents, but no one ever questioned his sincerity and courage. Köhler admitted that there were few practical accomplishments to which one could point, but he believed Heinzen had been far ahead of his time. He emphasized his "tender and self-sacrificing and warm heart," which, unfortunately, he never permitted the world to see.² Mrs. Edna D. Cheney, a friend of twenty years, spoke briefly on what Heinzen had done for the cause of equal rights. It was the dead man's request that he be buried with music, and so the procession of mourners, on foot and in carriages, proceeded to Forest Hills Cemetery to the solemn strains of a band. At the grave the chorus of the *Turnverein* sang a choral, the band played another selection, and a representative of the *Turnverein* spoke briefly. The first snow of the season was falling, but, as the casket was lowered into the grave, the evening sun broke, for a few moments, through the clouds.

The *Freidenker* of November 21, 1880, reviewed "the life of battle" of this "man of iron logic and unshakable conviction," lauded his ideals and his powerful will, and confidently proclaimed that his writings would be cherished and read by future generations—a prediction which, alas, has not come true. Mrs. Heinzen received many letters of condolence, along with resolutions of sympathy and respect from the *Freie Gemeinde* of Milwaukee, Sauk City, Buffalo, and elsewhere. Tributes and obituary notices appeared in many of the leading German-language papers in the United States, and abroad, in papers like *Der Beobachter* of Stuttgart, the *Bund* of Zurich, the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna, the *Nürnberger Anzeiger*, and the *Züricher Post*. The radical club of Detroit drafted memorial resolutions,

² *Gedenkbuch: Erinnerung an Karl Heinzen und an die Enthüllungsfeier des Heinzen Denkmals am 12. Juli 1886 in Boston, Massachusetts*, ed. Karl Schmemann (Milwaukee, 1887), pp. 89–94.

and letters and memorial poems arrived for days from towns in states as far away as Texas.

The Chicago *Turnverein* "Vorwärts" held a memorial service, which was reported at length in the *Illinois Staatszeitung*, a paper never friendly to Heinzen. The hall was decorated for the occasion with the republican flags of Germany, Switzerland, France, and the United States, and a large portrait of Heinzen hung above the stage. C. Hermann Boppe, editor of the *Freidenker*, made the main address. The *Schweizer Männerchor* sang, and several of Heinzen's poems were read, including his "Mein letzter Wunsch":

Im Wald lasst mich begraben sein!
Zwar werd' ich selber es nicht wissen,
Lieg ich auf einem harten Stein,
Oder auf einem Blätterkissen;
Doch wo mein liebster Aufenthalt,
Da lasst mich schlafen auch—im Wald.

Wenn es im Frühling blüht und singt,
Wenn es im Sommer schwirrt und säuselt,
Wenn es im Herbst reift und springt,
Wenn es im Winter braust und eiselt—
Zwar weiss ich's nicht, doch lasst mich nur
Vergeh'n im Leben der Natur.

Ihr sei, was von mir blieb, vertraut,
Sie nützt es für des Waldesleben,
Das auf sich aus Verwelktem baut,
Sich sprossend, blühend zu erheben.

Similar memorial exercises were held in Pekin, Illinois, and in Indianapolis. In Milwaukee a program was prepared for Heinzen's birthday in 1881. The *Free Religious Index* of Boston devoted an entire issue to Heinzen and published a sketch of his life by Julia Sprague and translations of the tributes paid him by Robert Reitzel and Karl Röser of the Washington *Volkstribun*. The editor of the *Index* described Heinzen's overpowering scorn and wrath, his deep love for humanity, his courage, his "genuine moral indignation," his "profound though shyly displayed

love of humanity," and his complete subordination of personal opinions and desires to the demands of truth. He discussed at length Heinzen's desire to substitute the "idea of a just state" for religion and also his "want of knowledge of mankind, from which must have proceeded partly that ungrounded distrust, partly that unjustifiable trust," in men. He had sought protection from the barbs of the world by clothing himself in "a stinging armor of thorns."³ George Chainey, a former Unitarian who had been introduced to Heinzen's writings by Dr. Ludwig Fritsch of Evansville, Indiana, paid a special tribute, in a memorial service held in Paine Memorial Hall in Boston,⁴ to the man who "steered right in the teeth of the wind and the face of the storm."

The most significant and pretentious of the memorial exercises, however, was arranged by the Germans of Boston for February 22, 1881. On that day they gathered in the Turner Hall, with German and American flags on the stage and a life-sized portrait of Heinzen framed in calla lilies and roses. The chorus sang, and Karl Edelheim of the Philadelphia *Freie Gemeinde* presented a mural crown to Heinzen's family, a white silk cushion with oak leaves embroidered upon it, and a crown of bronze, against a black-and-gold background. Edelheim's address compared the gift to a Roman crown, bestowed by that ancient republic upon one of its distinguished citizens. Clara Neymann of New York spoke, likened Heinzen to Washington, and emphasized Heinzen's battle for women's rights; and Robert Reitzel made an eloquent address in his flowery, oratorical style. A soloist sang Heinzen's "Die erste und einzige Liebe," and then the chairman introduced Wendell Phillips.

Phillips emphasized Heinzen's courage and self-sacrifice. He pointed out that, unlike so many immigrants, Heinzen never forgot the love of liberty which had driven him across the sea and

³ *Free Religious Index*, XII, 290-92.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 259, 290-93; cf. George Chainey, *Lessons from the Life and Work of Karl Heinzen* (Boston, 1881). Pp. 10.

always insisted upon extending it to all men, regardless of race, color, or creed. Heinzen had gladly sacrificed the material success which he might have won as a journalist to devote himself to the cause of the Negro, and Phillips related his personal experiences with Heinzen in the days before the war when they had fought shoulder to shoulder to bring about emancipation. In those trying times Phillips had found him to be "far-seeing and sagacious," "ingenious in contriving," a man of penetrating judgment and a wise prophet. "He stood with us," he continued, "when men did nothing but jeer and insult the cause, when scholars affected to despise it, when mobs broke up our meetings and man's social and pecuniary life was ruined by being seen in them. . . . He flung himself into our ranks . . . with his whole heart, taking on his shoulders the whole yoke, in all its heaviness and self-sacrifice." Phillips ended with the words of Tocqueville which Sumner loved to quote, "Remember life is neither pain nor pleasure—it is serious business—to be entered upon with courage, in the spirit of self-sacrifice."⁶ After Phillips' address, the following telegram from Felix Adler was read: "All honor to the fallen pioneer. May the liberals of this country widen the clearing which he has made in the forest of superstition." A song by the chorus of the *Turnverein* brought the ceremonies to a close.

In 1884 Heinzen memorial ceremonies were held in the Worker's Hall of Detroit, with Robert Reitzel as the chief speaker. The next year, Indianapolis and Sauk City, Wisconsin, had Heinzen celebrations, and for a number of years thereafter the anniversary of Heinzen's birth continued to be noted by his followers in many cities. In 1894 William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., spoke in Boston at a Washington and Heinzen celebration; the following year there was a similar observance in Detroit. In 1903 Albert Steinhauser, law partner of John Lind, made a me-

⁶ See *Boston Daily Advertiser*, February 23, 1881; and *Boston Evening Transcript*, February 23, 1881. The manuscript of Phillips' address is in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

memorial address in far-off New Ulm, Minnesota; and in 1909, on the occasion of the Heinzen centenary, George Schumm wrote a memorial article for the *New York Evening Post*. In that year, also, the *Boston Daily Advertiser* published a tribute by Louis C. Elson; the *Freidenker* issued a memorial edition; the *Boston Transcript* paid tribute to Heinzen's "uninterrupted warfare against stupidity, vulgarity and baseness"; and the Germans of Boston marked the Heinzen centennial in their Turner Hall.

In 1882 at a combined Washington and Heinzen celebration sponsored by the Boston *Turnverein* the suggestion had been made that a monument be erected over the grave of the editor of the *Pionier*. Though some insisted that this would be inappropriate in view of Heinzen's known dislike of monuments, funds for a memorial of granite were collected from many contributors, Prang leading the list with a gift of five hundred dollars. The assignment to execute the plans was given to Robert Kraus, a young German-American artist of Philadelphia. The unveiling occurred in Forest Hills Cemetery in 1886. A large crowd assembled for the occasion, and the Boston and Providence Railroad issued special round-trip tickets between Boston and Forest Hills for the "dedication of the Karl Heinzen Monument." In the course of his address Mr. Boppe of Milwaukee spoke of the mission of the United States to establish a world citizenship and to found a world community, based on liberty, and emphasized Heinzen's idea of revolution as "the restless creative or driving force in mankind." About five hundred people, including Heinzen's widow, his only son, and the latter's wife and little daughter, attended the dedication ceremonies. A singing society sang "In der Nacht," the president of the North American *Turnerbund* laid a wreath on the grave, and the program ended with another song, "Schlaf in Ruh."

Heinzen's monument stands in Forest Hills Cemetery, to mark the last resting-place of this restless champion of freedom and social justice. It is a nine-foot granite block, with a bronze bust of Heinzen at the top. On one side, in relief, there is

a harp to symbolize the poet, and a broken cross and a broken crown to symbolize Heinzen's interrupted labors. On the monument there are two inscriptions, one in English and the other in German. The English inscription reads: "His life work—the elevation of mankind." The German verse is Heinzen's own:

Die Freiheit war's, die mir den Geist beschwingte,
Die Wahrheit war's, die mir das Herz verjüngte.⁶

⁶ See *Amerikanische Turnzeitung*, February 28, May 16, June 6, 20, and 27, July 4, and September 12, 1886; and *Gedenkbuch: Erinnerung an Karl Heinzen und an die Enthüllungsfeier des Heinzen Denkmals am 12. Juli 1886 in Boston, Massachusetts* (Milwaukee, 1887). Pp. 105. The preparation of this little memorial volume was the work of Karl Schmemmann. See also an article by Louis Elson in *Boston Advertiser*, February 22, 1909, at the time of the Heinzen centenary.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

THE MAIN SOURCES FOR THIS BIOGRAPHY ARE the files of Heinzen's various weeklies and his publications, which total no less than seventy-one items. Most, but not all, of the latter were republished in Heinzen's collected works. I have read all of Heinzen's published works. I have also read the complete file of his *Janus* (New York, 1852) and a nearly complete file of *Der Pionier* (1854-79). There are incomplete files of the latter in the Boston and New York public libraries and in the Cornell University and the University of Illinois libraries, but the best is at Ann Arbor, in the Labadie Collection of the University of Michigan.

It was impossible to get files of Heinzen's earlier papers, *Die Deutsche Schnellpost* (New York, 1848 and 1851); the *New Yorker Deutsche Zeitung* (1853); and *Der Herold des Westens* (Louisville, 1853). Only one issue of *Der Völkerbund* (New York, 1850) was published. However, Heinzen preserved among his manuscripts many clippings from these and other papers, including some from European journals to which he contributed, and these were available to me.

To supplement this newspaper material, I have read Wilhelm Weitling's *Republik der Arbeiter* for 1852; *Die Turnzeitung* for 1858 and 1859; Christian Essellen's *Atlantis* from 1855 to 1858, inclusive; the *Freidenker* of Milwaukee for 1880 and 1881; and the *Amerikanische Turnzeitung* for 1886; and scattered numbers of other German-language papers.

The Heinzen manuscripts which were made available to me

included material of many kinds, such as letters to and from Heinzen, records of his business affairs, passports, newspaper clippings, original drafts of articles and lectures, and other interesting items covering practically the whole of Heinzen's career. The twenty-three letters from Ferdinand Freiligrath to Heinzen cover the period from 1845 to 1848. For the later years of Heinzen's life the letters of Karl Schmemann of Detroit were useful. They are now in the Labadie Collection at Ann Arbor.

I have tried to reduce the number of citations to a minimum, but I have referred to the most significant primary and secondary material at least once in the footnotes.

Three earlier monographs dealing with Heinzen must be noted. Hans Huber's *Karl Heinzen (1809-1880): Seine politische Entwicklung und publizistische Wirksamkeit* (Bern, 1932) is excellent but mainly concerned with Heinzen's European career. It is weak and incomplete for the period covering Heinzen's activities in the United States. Paul Otto Schinnerer's "Karl Heinzen, Reformer, Poet and Literary Critic," in *Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois* (Chicago), XV (1915), 84-144, is a good piece of work but is devoted largely, as the title indicates, to a criticism of Heinzen as a literary figure. The *Gedenkbuch: Erinnerung an Karl Heinzen und an die Enthüllungsfeier des Heinzen Denkmals am 12. Juli 1886 in Boston, Massachusetts*, was published in Milwaukee in 1887 and was edited by Karl Schmemann, a devoted follower of Heinzen. Schmemann and Schinnerer have included an identical list of Heinzen's publications.

INDEX

- Aachen, 3, 4, 28, 31
Aachener Zeitung, 23
 Abbot, F. E., 199
 Abolitionism, 84, 89, 91, 92, 94, 123,
 124, 130, 135, 172-78, 185-89, 191,
 193, 196-98, 231, 288, 291, 295, 301
 Adams, John, 152, 253
 Adler, Felix, 324
 Agitationsverein, 262
 "Alabama" claims, 262
 Alaska, 259-60
 Albany (N.Y.), 141, 301
 Alsace-Lorraine, 50, 75, 271, 274, 275,
 280
American Art Review, 320
 Americanism, 284, 299-300, 303-7,
 315
 Amsterdam, 12, 86
 Anarchism, 247-48
 Andersonville Prison, 197
 Andrew, John A., 192
 Anneke, Fritz, 61, 132, 263, 276
 Anneke, Mathilde, 132, 220, 225, 276
 Anthony, Susan B., 131-32
 Anticlericalism, 39, 45, 47, 94, 158-61,
 162-63, 180, 259
Antipfaff (St. Louis), 164
Anti-slavery Standard (New York), 205
 Antwerp, 35
Anzeiger des Westens (St. Louis), 43,
 101, 173, 184, 290
Arbeiter Union (New York), 135
Arbeiterbund, 288
Arbeitervereine, 63, 80, 316
Arme Teufel, Der, 123
 Army of the Potomac, 189
 Arnold, Franz, 88
 Asylum, right of, 40, 41
 Atheism, 39, 84, 120, 121, 123, 149-51,
 154-55, 156, 159, 162, 163, 164,
 165, 284
Atlantis, 94, 95, 123
Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, 68, 78
Ausgewählte Vorträge, 138
 Austria, 48, 64, 70, 259, 264, 265, 269,
 270, 272
 Austro-Prussian War, 270-71
 Bacon, Francis, 152
 Baden, 40, 49, 60, 61, 65, 66, 69, 70,
 76, 111, 181, 183, 311
Bahnbrecher (W.T.C.U.), 292
 Bakunin, Mikhail, 119, 149, 247
 Baltimore, 58, 86, 97, 99
 Baltimore Convention (1852), 173
 Bank of England, 38, 212
 Banks, Nathaniel P., 290
 Barnum, P. T., 120
 Basel, 39, 41, 66, 68, 69
Baseler National-Zeitung, 66
 Baselland, 41
 Batavia, 11, 13, 15, 24, 25
 Batavian Republic, 6
 Baumann, Fritz, 105
 Bavarians, 35, 40, 42, 48
 Bayreuth, 120
 Becker, August, 262
 Becker, Johann Philip, 62, 67, 70,
 71, 73
 Beecher, Henry Ward, 115, 162
 "Beer-hall Demosthenes" (Hassau-
 reck), 128
 Belgium, 31, 34, 35, 36, 41, 45, 119,
 275
Belletristisches Journal (New York), 88
 Belleville (Ill.), 59, 277
Belleviller Zeitung, 189, 290
 Bennett, James Gordon, 54
 Benton, Thomas Hart, 147
Beobachter, Der (Stuttgart), 321
 Berkeley, George, 149, 166
 Berlin, 10, 22, 31, 48, 59, 63, 69, 70,
 73, 132, 272, 305, 311
Berliner Kladderadatsch, 109

- Bern, 39, 41, 69, 76, 149, 158, 313
 Bernays, Charles L., 101
Berner Zeitung, 69
 Biel, 73
Bierbänkelei, 296-97
 Bill of Rights, 199-200
 Birkenfeld, 3
 Birsfelden, 39, 68
 Birth control, 215
 Bismarck, Otto von, 118, 120, 122, 125, 128, 161, 226, 249, 269, 270, 271-76, 277, 280, 299-300, 312
 "Black Republicans," 174
 Blackwell, Elizabeth, 103, 104
 Blackwell, Emily, 103
Blätter für freies religiöses Leben (Philadelphia), 192
Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung (Leipzig), 251
 Blanc, Louis, 80, 109
 "Bleeding Kansas," 174, 230
 Blenker, Ludwig, 61, 64, 180-84
 Blind, Karl, 62, 66, 99, 118, 262, 264, 277
 Blöde, Marie, 220
 Blue laws, 294
 Blum, Robert, 40
 Bock-beer festivals, 115
 Börnstein, Heinrich, 92
 Bonn, 2, 3, 9, 10, 310
 Bonn, University of, 3, 8, 9, 111
 Booth, John Wilkes, 195
 Booth, Mary Louise, 102, 132, 140, 220, 311
 Boppe, C. Hermann, 107, 322, 325
 Boston, 86, 97, 99, 100, 102, 112, 128, 131, 133, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143, 175-76, 177, 184, 190, 194, 205, 208, 211, 216, 217, 220, 227, 247, 256, 267, 289, 290, 292, 294, 301, 304, 309, 311, 315, 316, 319, 323, 324, 325-26
Boston Daily Advertiser, 325
Boston Germania, 137
Boston Investigator, 99, 164
Boston Journal, 106
 Boston Latin School, 105
 Boston and Providence Railroad, 325
Boston Transcript, 194, 320, 325
 Boston Turner Hall, 100, 136-38, 140, 320, 323-24, 325
Boston Turnzeitung, 137-38
 Brazil, 258
 Bremen, 86
 Bremer, Fredrika, 296
Bremer und Weser Zeitungen, 86
 Brentano, Lorenz, 61, 62, 69, 70, 72, 77, 83, 126, 280-81
 Breslau, 40, 119
 Bridgeport (Conn.), 289
 Brooklyn, 206
 Brown, John, 174-77, 187
 Brown, Owen, 176
Brüsseler Deutsche Zeitung, 86, 237
 Brunswick, Duke of, 43, 80, 239
 Brussels, 33, 34, 35, 36, 69, 86, 237
 Buchanan, James, 174, 187
 Büchner, Ludwig, 217
Bürgerfreund (Philadelphia), 43
 Bürgers, Heinrich, 34
 Buffalo (N.Y.), 139, 321
Buffalo Telegraph, 289
 Bull, Ole, 309
 Bull Run, Battle of, 178, 180, 181
 Bulwer, Edward, 43
Bund, 48, 52, 270
Bund (Zurich), 321
 Burlingame Treaty, 286
 Burns, Robert, 27
Burschenschaften, 61
 Butler, Benjamin F., 130, 188, 189
 Cabanis, P. J. G., 151
 California, 286
 Canada, Dominion of, 161, 252, 258
 Canary Islands, 13
 Cape of Good Hope, 13, 53
 Cape Verde Islands, 13
 Castle Garden, 285
 Catholicism, 4, 5, 19, 38, 48, 54, 63, 88, 94, 102, 103, 130-31, 132, 141, 148, 161, 217, 260, 266, 280, 284, 287, 288
 Cato, 145, 147
 Catskill Mountains, 141
Celestial Intelligencer and Medical Cabinet, The, 215
 Censorship, 28, 29, 30, 31, 49
 Centennial Exposition (1876), 225-26, 252-53
 Central America, 258
 Central Park (New York), 141, 219, 309
 Cervantes, Miguel de, 27
 Chainey, George, 323
 Chancellorsville, Battle of, 128, 180
 Chandler, Zach, 185
Charleston Mercury, 231

- Chase, Salmon P., 185, 189, 192, 195
 Cheyney, Mrs. Edna D., 321
 Chicago, 89, 138, 141, 277, 289, 291, 322
Chicago Daily Times, 90
Chicago Republican, 146
Chicago Union and Telegraph, 184
 Child, Marie, 176
 Chinese coolies, 286
 Christianity, 159–61, 165, 172
Christliche Apologete, 131, 161–62
 Church and state, 162–63
 Cicero, 49, 113, 139
 Cincinnati, 38, 43, 58, 59, 95, 121, 128, 137, 138, 139, 146, 172, 208, 263, 267, 296, 300
Cincinnati Commercial, 185, 194
Cincinnati Republikaner, 290
Cincinnati Volksblatt, 59, 122, 290
 Civil service reform, 128, 213
 Civil War, 64, 101, 105, 122, 178–89, 200, 202, 210, 212, 229, 231, 232, 253, 257, 258, 260, 261, 282, 286, 291, 294
 “Class struggle,” 234–35, 244
 Cleveland (Ohio), 86, 114, 140, 190–92, 195, 205
Cleveland Herald, 194
 Cleveland Medical College, 103
Cleveland True Democrat, 90
 Cleves, Duchy of, 5
 Club for Radical Progress, 70
 Cochrane, John, 193
 Cologne, 1, 2, 3, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 45, 73, 115, 236, 310
 Cologne-Belgian railway, 28
 Cologne-Bonn Railroad, 241
 Cologne Court of Appeals, 31
 Columbus (Ohio), 114, 138, 250
 Communism, 28, 34, 42, 54, 56, 61, 65, 68, 84, 120, 121, 149, 158, 225–26, 230, 236–40, 242, 244–45, 248–49, 262, 263
Communism and Socialism, 243–45
Communist Manifesto, 245
 Compromise of 1850, 172
 Comstock, Anthony, 200
 Congregationalism, 164
 Conscientious objectors, 256
 Constance, Lake, 76
 Constantinople, 11
 Constitutional monarchy, 48–49, 60, 63, 70
 Continentalism, 282, 293–94, 296
 Cooper Institute, 140
 Co-operative movement, 233, 245, 246
 Copperheads, 178, 187, 194, 200
 Cornell University, 129
Courrier des Etats-Unis (New York), 205
 Cracow, 50, 55
 Cuba, 259, 260
 Currency reform, 212–13
 Dana, Charles, 146
 Danubian federation, 264, 265
 Darmstadt, 29, 33, 38
 Darwinism, 108
 Davenport (Iowa), 93, 141
Davenport Demokrat, 173, 190, 290
 Davis, Jefferson, 186, 188, 194
 Dayton (Ohio), 89
 Declaration of Independence, 94
 Democratic party, 139, 171–72, 173, 178, 187, 198, 231, 288
 Democritus, 152
Demokrat (Buffalo), 288
Demokrat (Philadelphia), 43
Demokrat (St. Charles, Mo.), 173
Demokratisches Tageblatt (Cincinnati), 139
 Demosthenes, 139
 Denmark, 265, 270
 Descartes, René, 149
 Detroit, 107, 139, 140, 141, 142, 189, 190, 205, 206, 208, 217, 225, 264, 316, 319, 321, 324
Deutsch-Amerikaner (New York), 173
Deutsch-amerikanischer Dichterwald, 143
 Deutsche Gesellschaft, 56
Deutsche Schnellpost (New York), 38, 43, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 119, 123, 204, 219, 285
Deutsche Tribün, Der, 37, 40, 41
Deutsche Zuschauer, 69, 88
Deutscher Anzeiger (Providence, R.I.), 208
 Dickens, Charles, 109
 Divorce, 222–24
 Dörflinger, Carl, 108, 319
 Dolhaim, 33
 Douai, Adolf, 101, 122, 134–36, 216, 267, 289
 Douglas, Frederick, 176
 Douglas, Stephen A., 173–74
 “Douglas Iscariot,” 174
 Dred Scott decision, 174
 Dresden, 73, 110, 311

- Dubuque (Iowa), 141, 205
 Düren, 31
 Dürkheim, 311
 Dürkheim, Baron, 183
 Düsseldorf, 1, 2, 21, 22
 Dutch foreign legion, 10, 12, 13-14
 "Dutch plank," 177, 291

 East Indies, 11-16, 53
 Ecuador, 122
 Edinburgh, 311, 312
Editoren-Kongress, 116, 143, 298
 Educational reforms, 216-18
 Eichthal, Wilhelm von, 38, 43, 54, 55, 85, 123
Eidgenössische Zeitung, 41
 Eight-hour day, 232-34
Ein neues Wintermärchen, 279 n.
 Elberfeld, 24, 25
 Eleventh Army Corps, 128
 Elson, Louis, 116, 325
 Emancipation Proclamation, 187-89
 Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 130, 216, 304
 Encyclopedists, 266
 Engels, Friedrich, 237
 England, 41, 42, 43, 51, 79, 125, 252, 261-63, 270, 272, 280
 Epicurus, 152
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 113
 Erdmann, Eduard, 119
 Erft River, 1, 2
 Erlangen, 131
Erst reine Luft, dann reinen Boden, 158
 Essellen, Christian, 94, 95, 123
 European Congress of Peoples, 252, 265
European Soldier to His Comrades, A, 253
Evangelium eines armen Sünders, Das, 149
 Evansville (Ind.), 323
 Everett, Edward, 305
Evolution, Die (Biel), 71, 73

Fackel, Die, 124, 164
 Factory legislation, 233
 "Faille Déchirée," 34
 Fallersleben, Hoffmann von, 37, 43, 120, 149, 310
 Falmouth, 15
 Faneuil Hall, 127
 "Far West" (Friedrich Münch), 123
 Federalism: American, 202-3; German, 51-52, 64-65, 268
 Fenian movement, 252
 Fessenden, Abijah, 100
 Fessenden, W. P., 189
 Feuerbach, Ludwig, 37, 107, 119, 150, 157
 Feuilleton, 108-9
 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 157
 Fickler, Joseph, 63, 88, 89, 262
 Fifteenth Amendment, 197
 Fillmore, Millard, 97-98, 267, 287
 Fish, Hamilton, 311
 Flemish nationalism, 35
 Follen, August Adolf Ludwig, 148-49, 150-51
 Follen, Karl, 149
 Force Acts, 198
 Foreign policy, 251-53, 256, 257-62, 264-66, 267-68, 273, 274, 275-76
 Forest Hills Cemetery, 320, 321, 325
 "Forty-eighters," 64, 88, 91, 121-29, 164, 171, 227-28, 278, 281, 282, 284, 300-301
 Fourteenth Amendment, 197
 France, 11, 30, 35, 41, 46, 50, 68, 70, 71, 78, 186, 251, 256, 258, 259, 261, 265, 266, 267, 270, 272, 274, 275, 322; revolution in (1848), 57, 58
 Francis Joseph II, 194
 Franco-German relations, 68, 71, 265, 266, 271-76, 280, 299-300
 Franco-German War, 118, 125, 255, 267, 271-76, 299-300
 Frankfurt, 11, 39, 73, 310
 Frankfurt Parliament, 53, 62, 64, 65, 70, 77, 119, 239
Frauenzeitung (Milwaukee), 220
 Frederick William IV of Prussia, 48, 50, 53, 59, 73
 "Free Germans of Ohio," 95
Free Religious Index (Boston), 322
 Free Soil party, 121, 173
 Free speech, 29, 186-87, 188, 199-200, 201, 236, 249
 Freethinking societies, 91, 123, 129, 141, 164-65, 190, 206, 226, 321
Freidenker (Milwaukee), 104, 107, 108, 208, 318, 319, 321, 325
Freidenkerbund (New York), 236
Freie Gemeinde, 129, 141, 164-65, 225, 226, 321
Freie Presse (Indianapolis), 220, 290
Freie Presse (Philadelphia), 139, 184, 290

- Freie Presse* (Sandusky, Ohio), 136
 Freiligrath, Ferdinand, 11, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 44, 57, 58, 60, 86, 108, 109, 118, 119, 149, 264, 277, 313, 320
Freimännervereine, 95, 164, 300
Freisinnige, Der (Philadelphia), 164
 Frémont, John C., 129–30, 174, 180, 188, 189, 190–92, 193–95, 267
 Frémont clubs, 195
 French Enlightenment, 152
 French Revolution, 3, 45, 46, 71, 237, 266
 Fritsch, Ludwig, 322
 Fröbel, Julius, 37, 119, 149
 Fuess, Claude M., 126
 Fugitive Slave Law (1850), 94, 172, 174, 176, 185, 186

 Galeer, Albert, 41, 76, 313
 Galicia, 264
 Gambetta, Léon, 273, 275
 Garibaldi, Giuseppe, 252, 301
 Garrison, William Lloyd, 99, 103, 110, 116, 177, 267, 290
 Garrison, William Lloyd, Jr., 111, 324
Gegenwart (Berlin), 200
Gemüthlichkeit, 285, 295
 Geneva, 39, 41, 42, 54, 60, 65, 69, 76, 78, 86, 313, 315
 Genoa, 69
 George, Henry, 246
 German-American press, 23, 68, 78, 84, 85, 88, 95, 101, 139, 143, 173, 174–75, 189–90, 192, 236, 288, 302–3, 321, 322
 German-Americans, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 55, 57, 58, 59, 78, 84, 89, 90, 94, 96–97, 100, 114, 115, 116, 125, 144, 196, 264, 268, 269, 270, 275, 276–77, 278, 282–83, 284–85, 290, 295, 296–300, 305–7
 “German Athens” (Milwaukee), 141, 297
 “German colonels” (Civil War), 179–84
 German-Italian legion, 69
 German National Central Committee, 190
 “German Problem in Arithmetic, A,” 50
German Radicalism in America, 224
 German Revolutionary League, 263
 German schools, 91, 216–17, 264, 292, 299
German Soldiers’ Catechism, 253–54
 German Teachers’ Seminary, 264, 299
 German theater, 91
 German Workers’ party, 263
Germania (Bismarck’s), 312
Germania (Pa.), 227, 308–9
 Germans in Civil War, 178–84
 Gettysburg Address, 187
 Giessen, 39
 Gilmore’s Music Festival, 309
 Giovanelli, Prince, 314
 Glarus, 38
 Glasgow, 311
 Glücklich, F., 92–93
 Gögg, Amand, 63, 70, 87, 88, 256, 262
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 36, 107, 108, 235, 251, 298, 305
 Grand Army of the Republic, 254
 Grant, Ulysses S., 128, 198, 205, 206, 278
 Greece, 11
 Greek revolution, 181
 Greeley, Horace, 90, 115, 130, 188, 192, 206, 261
 Greenfield, Mary, 131
 Grevenbroich, 1, 2
 Grimes, J. W., 182
 Grün, Anastasius, 149
 Grün, Karl, 150
Guckkasten (Bern), 42
 Gummersbach, 22, 24, 25, 28

 Haeckel, Ernst Heinrich, 157
 Händel and Haydn Society, 116
 Hagedorn, Carl, 86
 Haiti, 186, 261
 Halifax, 54, 60
 Halle, 119
 Halleck, Henry W., 180, 189
Hallische Jahrbücher, 119, 237
 Halstead, Murat, 185
 Hamburg, 11, 64, 239, 311
Hamburg Schnellpost, 86
 Hanau, 39
 Hapsburg Empire, 270
 Harderwyk, 11, 12
Harper’s Bazaar, 102
 Harper’s Ferry, 175
 Hartford (Conn.), 86, 190
 Harvard College, 149, 218
 Hassaurek, Friederich, 95, 121–22, 128, 131

- Havre, 44, 53, 78, 86
 Hayes, Rutherford B., 129, 198, 213
 Hayes-Tilden election controversy, 198
 Hecker, Friedrich, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 125-26, 128, 179, 184, 239, 240, 263, 290, 296, 300
 Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 149, 157, 166
 Hegelianism, 34, 128, 237, 277
 Heidelberg, 70, 72, 75, 117, 125, 305, 310, 313
 Heine, Heinrich, 37, 119, 279
 Heinzen, Henriette Schiller, 22, 23, 34, 37, 81, 95, 98, 99, 113, 114, 135, 137, 138, 311, 316-17, 320, 321, 325
 Heinzen, Joseph, 1, 2-4, 6, 9, 10, 21
 Heinzen, Karl: birth, 1, 3; early years, 2-6; education, 6-8; at University of Bonn, 8-10; in Dutch service, 10-15; as Prussian soldier, 17-18; and Luise Schiller, 18-22; as tax-collector, 21-28; marriage, 22-23; literary activities of, 23, 25, 113, 114, 116, 117, 142-44; as railway and insurance official, 28; and Prussian bureaucracy, 28-32; and communism, 28, 34, 42, 54, 56, 225-26, 230, 236-40, 242, 244-45, 248-49; arrest and flight, 30-32; and republicanism, 30, 32, 50-52; and Marx, 33, 34, 36, 226-27, 230-40, 243, 244; refugee in Belgium, 33-36; and Freiligrath, 33-34, 36, 37, 38, 42-44, 57, 60, 118-19, 313, 320; in Switzerland, 36-44, 76-79; and Ruge, 37, 80, 83, 87, 119-20, 149-51, 217, 237, 247, 262, 266, 277, 320; and religion, 38, 39, 46-47, 48, 52, 120, 123, 148-56, 158-60, 161-63, 168-70; on tyrannicide, 39, 41, 73-75, 195, 267, 269; and philosophy of revolution, 39, 45-46, 57, 68-69, 71, 79, 239-40; on war and militarism, 50-51, 74, 191, 220-21, 253-56; in United States, 53-59, 81; editor of *Schnellpost*, 55-60, 83-88, of *Deutsche Zeitung*, 85-87, of *Janus*, 88-91, of *Herold des Westens*, 91-93, of *Pionier* (Louisville), 93; (Cincinnati), 93-94; (New York), 95-99; (Boston), 99-108; as Socialist, 56, 121, 149, 225-26, 231, 288, 291, 301, 323-24; return to Europe, 57-58, 64; and Hecker, 60, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 77-78, 79, 82, 125-26, 128, 179, 239; and Struve, 61, 66, 68, 69, 76, 80, 125, 320; in revolution of 1848-49, 64-77, 79, 239-40; in London, 79-81; as a lecturer, 82, 89, 99, 138-42, 192; as an abolitionist, 84, 89, 91, 92, 94, 123, 135, 172-78, 185-89, 191, 196-98, 221, 288, 291, 295, 301, 323-24; and woman's rights, 84, 94, 131-34, 219-24, 256, 294, 310, 320; and Dr. Zakrzewska, 102-4, 107, 108, 112, 113, 114, 134-38, 214, 220, 225, 310-11, 317, 318, 320; on temperance, 114-15, 292-94, 297, 310; and the Franco-German War, 118, 125, 255, 267, 271-76, 299-300; and know-nothingism, 126, 180, 184, 260, 283, 287, 288, 289, 291-92, 294-95, 305; and Schurz, 126-29, 176, 180, 290-91; materialist philosophy of, 151-56, 157-58, 166-67; and Christianity, 159-61, 165, 172; and Lincoln, 176, 177, 184-89, 192, 194-96; and the radical conventions of 1863 and 1864, 189-97; on government reforms, 201-11; on judicial reforms, 203, 209; on the presidency, 203-9; on medicine, 213-15; and phrenology, 215-16; on educational reform, 216-18; on land reforms, 231-32; on labor reforms, 232-34, 244-45; and the co-operative movement, 233, 245-46; and the class struggle, 234-35; and private property, 241-42, 244-45, 248; on foreign policy, 251-53, 256, 257-62, 264-66, 267-68, 273, 274-76; and the Bismarckian Empire, 269-77, 280, 299-300, 312; on immigration, 285-88; vacation trips of, 308-9; illnesses of, 309-10; journey to Europe, 310-15; death of, 320; memorial services for, 321-28
 Heinzen, Karl Friedrich Maximilian, 22, 23, 81, 82, 105-6, 325
Heinzen: Wie er ist, 135
 Heinzen, Wilhelm, 4
Helden des deutschen Kommunismus, Die, 238-39
 Herisau, 39
 Hermann (Mo.), 138, 173
Herold des Westens (Louisville), 91-93

- Herwegh, Georg, 37, 42, 43, 66, 108,
109, 118–19, 149, 247, 320
Hessen, 182, 183
Heyde, Gottfried von der, 93
Hillquit, Morris, 75 n.
Hobbes, Thomas, 152
Hoboken (N.J.), 82, 180
Hochwächter (Cincinnati), 59, 95, 110,
121
Hoff, Heinrich, 85
Hohenzollerns, 31, 48, 51, 269, 270,
271, 280, 315
Holland, 1, 6, 12, 13–15, 31, 265, 268,
275
Holocher, J. L., 91
Holst, Hermann von, 124–25, 299
Homestead Act, 124, 230–31, 246
Horace, 113
Howe, Julia, 103
Huber, Hans, 328
Hudson River, 141, 305, 315
Hünigen, 66
Hughes, John (Bishop), 158
Hugo, Victor, 161
Humboldt, Alexander von, 109, 157,
235, 297, 298
Hungary, 70, 76, 251, 257, 264–65,
267, 270
Hunter, David, 188
Huth, Friedrich, and Company, 42
Hutten, Ulrich von, 38, 83, 149, 305,
312–13
Huxley, Thomas Henry, 157
- Illinois, 192, 193
Illinois Staatszeitung, 136, 183, 184, 264,
276–77, 290, 322
Immigration policy, 285–88, 291
Immortality, 156–57
Income tax, 211, 246
Index (Boston), 199
India, 11
Indiana, 192
Indianapolis, 86, 129, 138, 140, 141,
142, 190, 205, 225, 300, 316, 322
Industrial revolution, 229–30, 242–43
Infirmary for Indigent Women and
Children, 104
Ingersoll, Robert G., 130
Inheritance tax, 246
Iowa Staatszeitung, 192
Irish, 81, 231, 252, 283, 287, 289, 290,
291, 293
“Irrepressible conflict,” 174, 176
Isolationism, 257
Italy, 11, 36, 70, 251, 257, 264, 265,
270, 271, 272, 274, 314
Itzstein, Baron von, 40, 44, 310
- Jackson, Andrew, 147, 186
Jacobins, 185
Jakobi, Abraham, 140
James, William, 255
Janus (New York), 88–91, 101, 138,
172, 173, 204, 219, 264, 266, 273,
285, 292
Japan, 259
Java, 11, 13, 15
Jefferson, Thomas, 152, 171
Jena, 33
Jesuits, 53, 54, 139, 158, 161, 162, 270,
288
Jesus, 88, 154, 160, 168
Jews, 49, 99
John Brown Association, 175
John Brown's raid, 174–75
Johnson, Andrew, 185, 196, 197, 205
Juárez, Benito, 261
Judicial reforms, 209
Judiciary, 203
Junkers, 48, 220, 254, 269, 279
Juvenal, 25
- Kaiserslautern, 72
Kansas-Nebraska Act, 174
Kant, Immanuel, 149, 157
Kapp, Friedrich, 85, 122, 140, 190,
268–69, 277, 299
Karlsruhe, 69, 70, 75
Karlsruher Zeitung, 73
Kassel, 39, 72
Katholische Kirchenzeitung (New York),
88, 110, 130–31, 223, 319
Kaulbach, Wilhelm von, 305
Keller, Gottfried, 40, 149, 151
Kempen, 7, 8
Kinder, Küche, Kirche, 219
Kindergarten, 102, 216
“King in dresscoat,” 204
Kinkel, Gottfried, 262–64
Kleve, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 18, 22, 28
Kneeland, Abner, 164
Know-Nothings, 126, 180, 184, 260,
283, 287, 288, 289, 291–92,
294–95, 305
Koch, Heinrich, 164
Köhler, S. R., 320–21
Kölnische Zeitung, 31, 78, 110, 269

- Körner, Gustav, 125-26, 146, 179, 263, 269, 277, 290
 Kohn, Theresia, 98, 99
Konduitenlisten, 25, 29
 Kossuth, Louis, 76, 79, 139, 257, 264-66, 267
 Kraus, Robert, 325
 Krez, Konrad, 173
 Kriege, Hermann, 124
 Kulturkampf, 161, 280
- Labor reforms, 232-34, 244, 245
 Lake Erie, 141
 Lamartine, Alphonse, 60, 68, 86
 Land reform, 231-32
 Landau, 72
Landtag (Prussian), 50
 "Latin farmer," 122
 League of peace, 256
 League of Radicals (Bund der Radikalen), 225-27, 231
 Lectures, 82, 89, 99, 138-42, 192
 Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste, 79, 119, 266, 274
Lehren der Revolution, Die, 79
 Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm von, 149, 157
 Leicester Square, 80
 Leipzig, 40, 311
Leipziger Allgemeine, 23, 28
 Lelewel, Joachim, 34
 Lèse majesté, 31, 50
Leseverein (New York), 140
 Leske, W., 29
Leslie's Weekly, 110
 Lesseps, Ferdinand de, 260
 Lessing, Gotthold E., 298, 305
Leuchtturm, 83
 Liberal League of America, 200
 Liberal Republican movement, 206
Liberator, The (Boston), 99, 140, 177, 290
Liberty (Boston), 247
 Liberty party, 191
Lichtfreund (Cincinnati), 164
 Lieber, Francis, 124
 Lieber, Hermann, 129, 225, 316, 319
 Liège, 3, 33
 Lincoln, Abraham, 122, 127, 176, 177, 184-90, 192, 194, 195-96, 197, 205
 Lincoln clubs, 195
 Lind, John, 324
 Lindau, Paul, 200
 Liszt, Franz, 37
- Liverpool, 59
 Livy, 113
 Loch Lomond, 311
 Lodges (German), 298
 Lörrach, 72
 "Loge des Humanismus, Die," 37, 120
 London, 42, 43, 60, 79, 86, 118, 121, 262, 263, 264, 266, 312
London Spectator, 205
Londoner Deutsche Zeitung, 43, 80, 86
 Lord's Day statutes, 161
 Louis Philippe, 57
Louisiana Staatszeitung (New Orleans), 174
 Louisville, 86, 91-93, 94, 101, 138
 Louisville platform, 94-95, 226, 289
 Lowell, James Russell, 304
 Lucas, A., 319
 Lucretius, 152
 Ludewig, Hermann E., 56
 Ludvig, Samuel Gottlieb, 124, 164
 Ludwig of Bavaria, 50
Lutheraner (St. Louis), 131
 Lynn (Mass.), 194
 Lyons, 86
- McClellan, George B., 183, 195
 Madeleine, Church of the, 315
 Madrid, 128
Männerchor, 140, 322
Magazin für die Literatur des Auslands (Berlin), 110, 251
 Magyars, 265
 "Main Street," 141
 Mainz, 40, 181, 182
 Malthusianism, 215
 Manifest destiny, 257
 Mann, Horace, 216
 Mannheim, 38, 61, 70, 310
Mannheimer Abendzeitung, 23, 64, 268
 Marburg, 39, 40
 Mardi Gras, 142
 Marriage, 222-24
 "Marseillaise," 276
 Marseille, 69
 Marx, Karl, 33-34, 36, 119, 152, 236-37, 238, 239, 240, 243, 244
 Marxhausen, C., 143
 Mason, J. M., 187
 Masonic fraternity, 298
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 217
 Materialism, 151-56, 157, 158, 166, 167

- Maximilian, Emperor, 261
 Mayo, A. D., 103
 Mazzini, Joseph, 43, 69, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 120-21, 252, 263, 266
 Medicine, 213-15
 Medill, Joseph, 185
Mehr als zwanzig Bogen, 33, 44-47, 240-41
 "Mein letzter Wunsch," 322
Menschenjagdbülletine, 172
 Methodism, 131, 161, 284, 292
 Metternich, Clemens Prince von, 50, 74
 Metz, 36, 273
 Mexico, 186, 258, 259, 260-61
 Meyer, Conrad, 151
Michigan Journal (Detroit), 189, 290
 Mieroslawski, Louis, 63, 71, 72
 Militarism, 50-51, 73, 191, 220-21, 253-55
 Mill, John Stuart, 65, 199
 Milwaukee, 132, 139, 141, 142, 190, 206, 208, 217, 225, 227, 290, 297, 316, 321, 322, 325
Milwaukee Herald, 304
Milwaukee Sentinel, 208
 Mirabeau, Honoré, 139
Misérables, *Les*, 161
 Missouri, 122, 128, 180, 183, 189, 192, 193
Missouri Demokrat, 205
Missouri Republican, 146-47
 Moleschott, Jacob M., 153, 217, 314
 Molière, 114
 Moltke, Helmuth, 277
 Monroe Doctrine, 186, 191, 193, 257-58, 259, 260, 299
 Montez, Lola, 50
 Moras, Carl Joseph, 18
 Moras, Theobald, 86
 Mosel Valley, 26
 Mosquito Coast, 258
 Most, Johann, 75 n.
 Mühl, Eduard, 164
 Mülforth, 2
 Münch, Friedrich, 122-23, 148
 Mundorf, 2
 Municipal government, 211
 Munich, 35, 40, 311
 "Murder" ("Der Mord"), 73
 Nahant (Mass.), 194
 Nancy, 36
 Napoleon I, 2, 6, 15, 38, 256, 300
 Napoleon III, 194, 258, 260-61, 266, 267, 270, 272, 273, 274, 277
 Nast, Wilhelm, 131
Nation, The (New York), 110, 129, 158, 205
National Gazette, 183
 National Labor Union, 233
 Nationalism, 46, 71, 250, 252, 265, 268
 Naturalization, 285, 286, 287, 291, 299-300
Nebel, Dr., 143
 Negro suffrage, 196-98
 Neo-Hegelianism, 37, 119, 149, 238
Neu England Zeitung, 172, 173
Neue Freie Presse (Vienna), 321
Neue Rheinische Zeitung, 239
Neue Welt (St. Louis), 220
Neue Zeit, Die (St. Louis), 189
Neue Zeit, Die (weekly), 133, 136
Neue Züricher Zeitung, 41
 Neutrality, 71, 72, 94
 New Braunfels (Tex.), 316
 New England Female Medical College, 103
 New England Hospital for Women and Children, 103
 New Orleans, 54, 264
 New Ulm (Minn.), 325
 New York City, 38, 43, 54, 57, 58, 82, 83, 95, 99, 134-35, 138, 139, 140, 142, 161, 190, 206, 209, 219, 225, 243, 252, 266, 267, 277, 285, 289, 296, 297, 305, 309, 315
New York Demokrat, 134-35, 136, 189, 290
New York Evening Post, 129, 175, 325
New York Times, 180, 205, 267
New York Tribune, 90, 180, 181, 183, 295
New Yorker Abendzeitung, 139, 182, 184, 196, 290
New Yorker Deutsche Zeitung, 39, 85, 87, 89
New Yorker Kriminalzeitung, 88, 140, 220, 290
New Yorker Staatszeitung, 68, 84, 88, 91, 96, 99, 173, 220, 222, 239, 276, 288
 Newark (N.J.), 140, 189, 190, 205, 208, 289
Newark Freie Zeitung, 189
 Newport (R.I.), 86
 Neymann, Clara, 133-34, 323
 Niagara Falls, 117, 194

- Nice, 274
 Nicholas, Czar, 50
 Nievenheim, 4, 5
Nordstern (Hamburg), 110
North American Review, 234, 284
 North German Confederation, 272
Nürnberger Anzeiger, 321
 Nuremberg, 40, 110
- Oberlin College, 173 n.
 Oels, Rösler von, 88
 Oertel, Maximilian, 88, 130–31, 319
 Old Lutheran, 131
 Oleana, 309
Opposition, Die (Zurich), 37, 39, 119, 158, 313
 Orpheus Chorus, 320
 Orsini, 267
 Osterhaus, Peter, 64
 Otto, M., 85
 Ovid, 113
- Padua, 314
 Paine Memorial Hall (Boston), 323
 Palatinate, 69, 70, 72, 183
 Panama Canal, 260
 Panic: of 1857, 98, 235; of 1873, 235–36
 Paraguay, 266
 Paris, 34, 44, 60, 66, 69, 71, 77, 86, 266, 273–74, 275, 312–13, 315
 Parker, Theodore, 99, 304
 Parliamentaryism, 46, 261–62
 Paul, Johann, 113
 Peking (Ill.), 319, 322
 Penology, 213–14
Peoria Deutsche Zeitung, 220
 Persia, 11
 Philadelphia, 38, 55, 58, 78, 89, 96, 97, 99, 138, 139, 140, 225–26, 263, 289, 323, 325
Philadelphia Tageblatt, 227
 Phillips, Wendell, 103, 110, 115, 116, 138, 146, 176, 177, 185, 188, 194, 205, 214, 220, 232, 301, 323–24
 Phrenology, 125, 215–16
 Pierce, Franklin, 173
Pionier, Der, 86, 93; in Louisville, 93; in Cincinnati, 93–94; in New York, 95–99; in Boston, 30, 34, 53, 90–108, 113, 116, 118, 120, 123, 125, 127, 128, 129, 134, 135, 136, 138, 140, 142, 157, 164, 175, 177, 178, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 189–90, 191, 192, 194, 197, 204, 205, 208, 209, 211, 214, 217, 219, 220, 222, 224, 226, 227, 230, 231, 234, 236, 240, 248, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 258, 265, 267, 268, 269, 274, 275, 277, 279, 281, 286, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 300, 302, 308, 310, 311, 313, 315, 316, 317–18, 325
Pionier album, 106–7
 Pittsburgh, 117, 138, 264
Pittsburgh Freiheitsfreund, 183
 Plato, 113, 149, 166, 245
 Plebiscites, 203
 Pliny, 113
 Poe, Edgar Allen, 109
 Poland, 17, 50, 63, 71, 251, 252, 265, 270, 271
 Poll tax, 198
 Polygamy, 174
 Polytechnic Institute of Zurich, 105
 "Popular sovereignty," 174
 Portugal, 12
 Prairie du Chien (Wis.), 141
 Prang, Louis, 102, 104–5, 106, 184, 227, 289, 320
 Prang, Louis, and Company, 107
 Prang, Rosa, 105–6
Prang's Aids for Objective Teaching, 105
 "Prang's Natural History Series," 105
 "Prayer of the Twenty Million," 188
 Presidency, the, 203, 204–9, 261
 Pretorius, Emil, 183–84
Preussische Bureaokratie, Die, 28–32, 44
 Prince of Wales, 262
 Private property, 241–42, 244–45, 248
Professor Irrwisch, 143
Prophylactic Star (Albany), 215
 Proportional representation, 210
 Prostitution, 221, 223
 Protestantism, 48, 161–62, 284, 287
 Proudhon, Pierre Joseph, 230, 247, 248
 Prussia, 29, 35, 36, 40, 42, 48, 49, 62, 64, 70, 72, 120, 264, 270, 300
 Prussian bureaucracy, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 33, 44, 151, 269
 Prussian militarism, 17, 50–51, 254, 270, 278, 280
 Prussian monarchy, 27, 29, 31, 32, 45, 47, 48, 73, 269–70, 272, 276, 278, 280
 Prussianism, 32, 36, 42, 47, 48, 268–69, 280
 Public Garden (Boston), 211
 Public works, 235

- Puritanism, 282, 288
 Put-in-Bay (Ohio), 141
 Putnam, Dr., 130
- Quincy, Josiah, 216
 Quincy (Ill.), 205
Quincy Tribune, 190
- Raabe, Wilhelm, 269 n.
 Radical Convention: of 1863, 140, 190–92; of 1864, 192–94, 226, 294
 "Radical Democracy," 193
Radical Review (Madison, Wis.), 129
 Railroad strikes (1877), 233–34
 Raphael, 235
 Rapperswyl, 38, 313
Rattenkönig, 93
 Rattermann, Heinrich, 137, 146
 Recall, the, 209–10
 Reconstruction policy, 196–98
 Red Shirts (Garibaldi), 252
 Refugee psychology, 35
 Reichard, J. M., 183
Reise eines deutschen Romantikers nach Batavia, 13
 Reitzel, Robert, 123–24, 225–26, 322, 323, 324
Republic (Plato), 245
 Republican party, 126, 128, 174, 177, 178, 210, 230, 288, 289, 290, 294; campaign of 1860, 176–77, 198, 230, 288, 291
 Republicanism, 30, 32, 39, 46–49, 59, 64–65, 68, 70, 71, 172, 177, 190, 252–53, 257, 266, 279
Republik der Arbeiter (New Orleans), 121
Republikaner (Cincinnati), 121
 Revolution, 39, 45–47, 48, 51, 57, 58, 190, 250, 256, 325; of 1830, 43, 63, 119; of 1848–49, 33, 44, 57, 58, 60–76, 87, 103, 121, 124, 125–26, 127, 132, 181–82, 184, 239–40, 251, 257, 262–64
Revue des deux mondes, 86
Rheinische Zeitung, 23, 28, 78, 236–37
 Rhine River, 36, 117, 275, 305, 312
 Rhineland, 31, 32, 45, 48, 117, 310
Rights of Women and the Sexual Relations, The, 223
 Robespierre, 62, 73, 149, 168, 201, 266
 Rochester (N.Y.), 141
- Röser, Karl, 322
 Rome, 69, 161, 271
 Rose, Ernestine, 132, 220
 Rothacker, Wilhelm, 101
 Rotterdam, 11, 15
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 113, 114, 168, 235
 Roxbury (Mass.), 102, 130, 134, 137, 309, 316
 Ruge, Arnold, 37, 43, 44, 80, 83, 87, 119–20, 149, 150, 217, 237, 247, 262, 266, 277, 320
 Russia, 30, 32, 46, 48, 70, 71, 152, 265, 271, 272, 280
- Sängerfeste*, 298
 St. Helena, 15
 St. Louis, 38, 43, 139, 141, 189, 190, 205
 St. Mark's, Square of, 314
 St. Patrick's Cathedral (New York), 161
 St. Paul (Minn.), 205
 St. Petersburg, 70, 73
San Antonio Zeitung, 135
 Sanborn, Frank, 176
 Sandusky (Ohio), 136, 141, 319
Sandusky Intelligenzblatt, 289
Sandusky Register, 205
 Santo Domingo, 128, 261
 Sardinia, 252
 Sarrebruck, 3
 Sauk City (Wis.), 134, 141, 225, 316, 321, 324
 Savoy, 274
 Schäfler, F., 319
 Schaffhausen, 117
 Schiller, August, 18, 22
 Schiller, Friedrich, 108, 109, 113, 298, 305
 Schiller, Luise, 18–22, 143
 Schimmelpfenning, Alexander, 64, 262
 Schinnerer, Paul Otto, 144 n., 328
 Schleswig-Holstein, 270
 Schmemann, Karl, 107, 129, 225–26, 227, 310, 316, 317, 319, 320, 328
 Schmidt, F. E., 108
 Schmieding, George, 140, 142, 316, 319
 Schmitz, Maria Elizabetha, 1, 4, 9
 Schroeter, Eduard, 147, 225
 Schubert, Franz, 109
 Schünemann-Pott, F., 192
 Schulz, Wilhelm, 149

- Schumm, Emma Heller, 223
 Schumm, George, 20, 129, 227, 247, 310, 318, 325
 Schurz, Carl, 64, 126-29, 176, 180, 184, 185, 190, 194, 205, 213, 237, 261, 262, 266, 277, 278, 290-91, 299
 Schusterinsel, 66, 67
 "Schwanenburg, Die," 6
 Scott, Sir Walter, 108
 Scott, Winfield, 173, 187
 Sedan, 273
Seeblätter (Constance), 63
 Seeger, Ludwig, 37
 Seidensticker, George F., 43, 55
 Senate (United States), 203, 204
 "Sermon to Soldiers," 73
 Seven Weeks' War (1866), 272
 Severance, Mrs. C. M., 103
 Seward, William H., 127, 176, 185, 194, 259, 261
 Shakespeare Hall (New York), 58, 82, 88
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 109
 Sherman, John, 185
 Sicily, 11, 63, 69
 Sigel, Franz, 63, 64, 71, 76, 89, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183-84, 262
 Simon, H., 40
 Singing societies, 297-98
 Single tax, 246
Six Letters to a Pious Man, 158-60
 Slidell, John, 187
 Smith, Elizabeth Oakes, 132
 Socialism, 56, 121, 149, 225-26, 230, 234, 236, 241-42, 245-47, 248
 Society for the Dissemination of Radical Principles (Verein zur Verbreitung radikaler Prinzipien), 129, 158, 201, 224-25, 243, 253
 Socrates, 88, 168
 Solger, Reinhold, 190
Sonntagsblatt (*Schnellpost*), 85, 86
Soziale Republik (New York), 288, 290
 Spain, 186, 251, 259, 260, 266
 Spinoza, Benedict de, 149, 157
 Spiritualism, 215
 Sprague, Julia A., 102, 113, 114, 136, 311, 318, 322
 Springfield (Ill.), 186, 196
Springfield Republican, 185
 Stallo, Bernhard, 122, 190, 290, 299
 Standish, Miles, 305
 Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, 131-32
 "Steckbrief," 31
 Steinhauser, Albert, 324
 Steinwehr, Adolph, 180
 Stevens, Thaddeus, 130, 191
 Stone, Lucy, 103, 220
 Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 109
 Strassburg, 36, 67, 68, 75, 77, 86, 126, 273
 Strikes, 233, 234
 Struve, Gustav, 61, 62, 66, 68, 69, 70, 76, 78, 80, 88, 125, 126, 183, 262, 288, 290, 320
 Stuttgart, 40
 Sumatra, 11, 13
 Sumner, Charles, 129, 130, 185, 205, 258, 324
 Sunda Strait, 13
 Supreme Court, 203, 205
 "Supreme War Lord," 272
 Swiss-German legion, 70
 Switzerland, 11, 36-44, 53, 61, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 76, 78, 83, 119, 120, 125, 148, 149, 182, 237, 312-13, 322
 Sylvis, W. H., 233
Tafelrunde (Washington), 215
 "Tall tales," 109
 Tammany Hall, 99
 Tappan, Arthur, 173 n.
 Tariff, 211, 212
 Taylor, Bayard, 37
 Temperance, 114-15, 292-94, 297, 310
 Tennyson, Alfred, 43
 Teutonia Assembly Hall (New York), 243
Teutsche Revolution: Gesammelte Flug-schriften, 44, 47-51
 Texas, 134, 259, 322
 Third French Republic, 267, 275, 277, 278
 Thirteenth Amendment, 196-97
 "Thirty Articles of War," 50-51, 253
 Thirty Years' War, 2, 277
 Thomas, George H., 189
 Tilden, Samuel J., 198
Times (London), 79-80
 Tocqueville, Alexis Charles de, 324
 Toledo (Ohio), 89, 138, 139, 140, 289
Toledo Express, 289
 Tower of London, 15
 Treaty of Lunéville, 2
 Tremont Temple (Boston), 175-76
 "Trent" affair, 187
 "True Americanism," 127
 Tucker, Benjamin R., 223

- Tübingen, 40
 Turin, 314
Turn Zeitung, Die (Baltimore), 100–101, 110, 174–75, 289, 300
Turnerbund (North American), 101, 300, 325
Turnvereine, 61, 63, 88, 91, 100–101, 129, 136, 173, 175–76, 196, 206, 208, 225, 256, 277, 285, 289, 296, 297, 300–301, 304, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323–24, 325–26
 Tweed Ring, 209
 “Two-year amendment” (Mass.), 177, 288, 289–91, 292
 Tyssowski, Ivan, 55, 58, 83, 84
 Tyrannicide, 39, 41, 73–75, 195, 267, 269

 Ufnau, 38, 312
 Ulm, 40
 Unitarianism, 164, 323
 United States Constitution, 202, 303
 United States Sanitary Commission, 178
 Universalism, 164
Urwähler (Vienna), 110
 Utica (N.Y.), 142
 Utrecht, 15

 Vacation trips, 308–9, 310–15
 Vale, Gilbert, 164
 Valentin, Veit, 62, 77
 Vallandigham, Clement L., 187–88
 Vegetarianism, 125
 Venetia, 271
 Venice, 314
Vereinsleben, 100, 295–97
 Verona, 314
 Victoria, Queen, 118, 258
 Vienna, 63, 264, 269
 Villard, Oswald Garrison, 129
 Virchow, Rudolf, 157, 217
Völkerbund, Der (New York), 39, 76, 82, 83
 Vogt, Karl B., 153, 217
Volksfeste, 296, 298
Volkstribüne (New York), 124
Volkstribun (Washington), 322
Volksvereine, 63
 Voltaire, 36, 113, 226, 266

 Vosges Mountains, 36, 275
 “Vote Yourself a Farm,” 230

 “Wacht am Rhein, Die,” 276
 Wade, Benjamin F., 130, 182, 185, 195
Wächter am Erie (Cleveland), 189, 191, 290
 Wage system, 245, 246
 Wagenitz, Wilhelm, 55, 82, 88, 90
 Wagner, Richard, 120
Wahrheitssucher (New York), 124
Wahrheitsverbreiter (Baltimore), 124
 Walensee, 38
 Walther, C. F., 131
 Walther, Friedrich G., 93
 War, 50–51, 74, 220–21, 253–56
 Warsaw, 17
 Wartburg Festival, 149
 Washington, D.C., 123, 140, 182, 186, 189, 190, 192, 258, 285
 Washington, George, 149, 324, 325
Washington National Era, 90
Washington Star, 183
 Webster, Daniel, 267, 305
Wecker (Baltimore), 174
 Weitling, Wilhelm, 54, 56, 88, 121, 149, 238, 263
 Wendt, Mathilde F., 133, 220
 West Point (N.Y.), 141
Westbote (Columbus, Ohio), 138
Westliche Post (St. Louis), 128, 136, 183, 192, 290
 “Westphalia” (corps), 9
What Is Real Democracy, 201–2
 Whig party, 172–73
 Whitman, Walt, 216
 Wiesbaden, 39, 310
 Wilhelmshöhe, 274
 William I, Kaiser, 194, 226, 243, 275, 277, 279, 299–300
 Willich, August, 64, 121, 290
 Wilson, Henry, 182
 Wirz, Henry, 197
 Wisconsin, 127, 192
Wisconsin Demokrat, 290
 Witlar, 4, 5
Wochenblatt (Hermann, Mo.), 173
 Wollenweber, L. A., 164
 Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, 292
Woman’s Journal (Boston), 220, 256
 Woman’s rights, 84, 94, 131–34, 141, 174, 219–24, 256, 294, 310, 320

- Women's temperance crusade (Ohio), 293-94
Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly, 200
 Wordsworth, William, 108
 Workers' congresses, 233
 World court, 256
 Worms, 181, 182
 Wright, Fanny, 220
 Young Men's Christian Association, 162
 Zakrzewska, Marie E., 102-4, 107, 108, 112, 113, 114, 134-38, 214, 220, 225, 310, 311, 317, 318, 320
 Zerrahn, Carl, 116
Zollverein (German), 212
Züricher Post, 321
Zukunft (Chicago), 205
 Zurich, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 119, 148-49, 312-13, 315
 Zwingli, Ulrich, 149

